arXiv:1004.2578v2 [math.NT] 29 Apr 2010

On the ‘main conjecture’ of equivariant Iwasawa theory

Jürgen Ritter · Alfred Weiss [*]

The ‘main conjecture’ of equivariant Iwasawa theory concerns the situation where

> l is a fixed odd prime number, K/k is a Galois extension of totally real number fields with $k/\mathbb{Q}$ and K/k_∞ finite, where k_∞/k is the cyclotomic $\mathbb{Z}_l$-extension (we set $G = G(K/k)$ and $\Gamma_k = G(k_\infty/k)$),
>
> S a fixed finite set (which will normally be suppressed in the notation) of primes of k containing all primes which ramify in K and all archimedean primes, and M is the maximal abelian l-extension of K unramified outside S (we set $X = G(M/K)$).

It asserts that a canonical refinement $\mho = \mho_S$ of the Iwasawa module X is determined by the Iwasawa L-function $L_{K/k} = L_{K/k,S}$. The data $\mho$ and $L_{K/k}$ have been defined in [RW2] and we briefly recapitulate what is needed here.

Denote by ΛG, $\mathcal{Q}G$ the completed group ring $\mathbb{Z}_l[[G]]$ of G over $\mathbb{Z}_l$ and its total ring of fractions, respectively. The localization sequence of K-theory

$$K_1(\Lambda G) \to K_1(\mathcal{Q}G) \overset{\partial}{\to} K_0T(\Lambda G) \to K_0(\mathcal{Q}G)$$

has $\mho$ in $K_0T(\Lambda G)$ (see [loc.cit., p.563]).

The reduced norms of the Wedderburn components of the semi-simple algebra $\mathcal{Q}G$ induce the map (see [loc.cit., Theorem 8])

$$\mathrm{Det} : K_1(\mathcal{Q}G) \to \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_lG, (\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k)^\times)\,.$$

The Iwasawa L-function $L_{K/k}$ is derived from the S-truncated l-adic Artin L-functions (see [loc.cit., Proposition 11]) and belongs to the above group Hom^*.

The equivariant ‘main conjecture’ asserts that *there is a unique element* $\Theta \in K_1(\mathcal{Q}G)$ *satisfying* $\mathrm{Det}(\Theta) = L_{K/k}$ *and, moreover, that this* Θ *has* $\partial(\Theta) = \mho$. In other words, Θ is the nonabelian pseudomeasure of K/k.

THEOREM. *If Iwasawa's* μ*-invariant* $\mu_{K/k}$ *vanishes, then the ‘main conjecture’ of equivariant Iwasawa theory for* K/k *holds, up to its uniqueness statement.*

---

[*] We acknowledge financial support provided by DFG and NSERC.

There are now much more general conjectures on nonabelian Iwasawa theory, especially in [FK] and [Ka], which also have extensive bibliographies.

The proof of the THEOREM depends on our previous work. So we start by describing certain reductions in terms of Propositions for which we provide programmatic proofs in §1.

Our first reduction, in [RW3,4], of the proof of the THEOREM loses the uniqueness assertion of the conjecture; we accepted this because uniqueness would follow from $SK_1(\mathcal{Q}G) = 1$, as conjectured by Suslin (see [RW2, Remark E]). It also requires us to assume that $\mu_{K/k} = 0$, as conjectured by Iwasawa, in order to bring in the localization $\Lambda_\bullet G$ of ΛG obtained by inverting all central elements which are regular modulo l and even the completion $\Lambda_\wedge G$ of the localization, which permits a logarithmic approach yielding

PROPOSITION 1. *The* THEOREM *holds if, and only if,* $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$.

Note that $\mho$ no longer appears: this is a consequence of the Main Conjecture of classical Iwasawa theory, proved by Wiles [Wi].

Define K/k to be *l-elementary*, if $G(K/k) = \langle z\rangle \times G[l]$ is a direct product of a finite cyclic group $\langle z\rangle$ of order $|z|$ prime to l and a pro-l group $G[l]$.

The second reduction is due to induction techniques, [RW4], for l-adic characters with open kernel, from which we obtain

PROPOSITION 2. *If* $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G(K/k))$ *holds whenever* K/k *is l-elementary, then* $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G(K/k))$ *for arbitrary extensions* K/k. [1]

From now on, K/k *is always l-elementary* [2].

The third reduction comes from a logarithmic interpretation of '$L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$' by means of diagram (D1) in §1: the point is that the nontriviality of the kernel of 'Det' on $K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ is an obstacle to inductive constructions of preimages of the Iwasawa L-function.

PROPOSITION 3. $\quad L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \iff t_{K/k} \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$

Here, the *logarithmic pseudomeasure* $t_{K/k} \in T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G)$ is recalled in §1. The proposition is a consequence of the validity of the *torsion congruence*, which follows from the q-expansion principle of Deligne and Ribet [DR]. The proof, [RW5,§3], of the proposition for pro-l extensions is extended to l-elementary extensions in §1.

The methods developed for proving Proposition 3 combined with its emphasis on working in the T-world motivates a new ingredient, the restriction $\mathrm{Res}_G^U : T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G) \to T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge U)$ for open subgroups $U \geq \langle z\rangle$ of G, and to

---

[1] Actually, the uniqueness assertion of the 'main conjecture' can also be reduced to l-elementary K/k, see [La, Chapter 4].

[2] if not otherwise implied

PROPOSITION 4. *If G has an abelian subgroup A of index l, then the* THEOREM *holds*[3].

In fact, most of the ideas of the present paper have already appeared in the proof of Proposition 4, in embryo. Thus the proof of the THEOREM can be viewed as a full generalization of [RW8], i.e., we *generalize* the Wall congruence (see Proposition 5), the torsion congruence (see Proposition 6) and the proof of Proposition 4 (see Theorem 7).

Let μ_Q denote the Möbius function of the partially ordered set of subgroups of the finite l-group Q. Recall that $\mu = \mu_Q$ is defined by

$$\mu(1) = 1\,,\ \mu(Q') = -\sum_{1\le Q''<Q'} \mu(Q'') \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \neq Q' \leq Q\,.$$

PROPOSITION 5. ("Möbius-Wall") *Let A be an abelian normal open subgroup of $G = G(K/k)$ so that $Q = G/A$ is a finite l-group. If ϵ is a unit of $\Lambda_\wedge G$, then*

$$\sum_{A\le U\le G} \mu_Q(U/A)\mathrm{ver}_U^A(\mathrm{res}\,_G^U\epsilon) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)\,.$$

Here, $\mathrm{ver}_U^A : \Lambda_\wedge U \to \Lambda_\wedge A$ extends the group transfer $U \to U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to A$ to a ring homomorphism between their Iwasawa algebras in the customary way[4]. Proposition 5 is proved in §2.

Let S' denote the set of all non-archimedean primes of S and $k \subseteq f \subset K$ with $[f:k] < \infty$. The pseudomeasure $\lambda_f = \lambda_{f,S'}$ of [Se] is associated to the maximal abelian S'-ramified extension $f_{S'}$ of f. We extend this notation to intermediate fields F of $f_{S'}/f_\infty$ by defining $\lambda_{F/f} = \mathrm{defl}^{G(F/f)}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}\lambda_f$, where $\mathrm{defl}^{G(F/f)}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}$ is the deflation map $\Lambda_\wedge G(f_{S'}/f) \to \Lambda_\wedge G(F/f)$. Now we can state

PROPOSITION 6. *Notation as in Proposition 5,*

$$\sum_{A\le U\le G} \mu_Q(U/A)\mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A(\lambda_{K^{[U,U]}/K^U}) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\bullet A)\,.$$

The proof of the Proposition follows from [RW9, Theorem], which again builds on [DR]; see §3.

As has been mentioned in the introduction of [RW9], combining the 'main conjecture' with Proposition 5 implies Proposition 6. Conversely, fusing Propositions 5 and 6 leads to a partial generalization of Proposition 4 and its proof.

---

[3] The generalization of [RW8, Theorem] to the l-elementary case is already in [La, Chapter 2].

[4] The inverse system of $\mathbb{Z}_l$-linear extensions $\mathbb{Z}_l[U/V] \to \mathbb{Z}_l[A/V]$ of the group tranfers $U/V \to A/V$, where V runs through the normal open subgroups of U contained in A , give rise to the transfer $\Lambda U \to \Lambda A$, which is a ring homomorphism that can be localized and completed. Note that $\mathrm{ver}_U^A = \mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}$ factors through U^{ab}.

Theorem 7. *Let $A \geq \langle z \rangle$ be an abelian normal open subgroup of $G = G(K/k)$ and C a central subgroup of exponent l contained in A. If $t_{K^C/k}$ is integral, then there exists a $\xi \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ with $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G/C}\xi = t_{K^C/k}$ and $\mathrm{Res}_G^A \xi = t_{K/K^A}$.*

Parts of the proof of Theorem 7, in §4, are easier versions of arguments appearing already in [RW8] but repeated here for the convenience of the reader. The real strength of the theorem is that it serves as a catalyst for the proof of the Theorem.

The Theorem is proved in §5 by making suitable modifications in $T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ of the element ξ provided by Theorem 7.

Section 6 contains the necessary extension of the integral logarithm to l-elementary groups. This is based on using projections to the integral logarithm for pro-l groups with unramified coefficients, which is already in [RW3]. It also discusses ‘Res’ and the l-elementary ingredients of the proof of Proposition 3.

Finally, in a short appendix, we take the opportunity of straightening out an inaccuracy in the proof of [RW2, Proposition 12]. In it we have referred to [RWt] where, however, Leopoldt’s conjecture is assumed to hold. In the appendix we now outline an argument which is not based on this conjecture.

1. “Proofs” of Propositions 1,2,3,4

Proposition 1, for pro-l groups, is reduced via the Main Conjecture, as in [RW3,§1], to the stronger form of Theorem B in [loc.cit.,§6]. The essential ingredient in this form of Theorem B is the integral group logarithm $\mathbb{L}$ defined by the commutative square (see [loc.cit., Proposition 11])

(D1)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r, "\mathbb{L}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Det}"'] & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Tr}"', "\simeq"] \\
\mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda^{\mathrm{c}}_\wedge \Gamma_k)^\times) \arrow[r, "\mathbf{L}"] & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G, \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_\wedge \Gamma_k)
\end{tikzcd} ,$$

with $T(R) = R/[R,R]$ for any ring R, where $[R,R]$ is the additive subgroup generated by all Lie commutators $[a,b] = ab - ba$, $a, b \in R$, and with the isomorphism ‘Tr’ induced by the reduced trace of $\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G$. For HOM and $\mathbf{L}$ see [loc.cit.,p.37]. The logarithm $\mathbb{L}$ is called integral because it takes values in $T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$. Note that the Wall congruence, which plays an important role later, makes its first appearance in [loc.cit., Lemma 12]. It is also important to observe, [loc.cit.,p.42], that [5] $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{HOM}$.

The generalization to arbitrary extensions K/k is carried out in [RW4, Theorems (A) and (B)]. □

Proposition 2 is [RW4, Theorem (C)]. □

---

[5] $L_{K/k}(\chi)^l \equiv \Psi(L_{K/k}(\psi_l \chi)) \mod l\Lambda_\wedge(\Gamma_k)$

We should stress that (D1) is available to define $\mathbb{L}$ for arbitrary groups $G = G(K/k)$ and that its integrality property, $\mathbb{L}(K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)) \subseteq T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$, holds when G is l-elementary. This will be discussed in §6.

As a direct consequence, there is a unique element $t_{K/k} \in T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G)$, the logarithmic pseudomeasure of K/k, such that $\mathrm{Tr}(t_{K/k}) = \mathbf{L}(L_{K/k})$. By (D1) and i) of Lemma I in §6, $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ implies $t_{K/k} \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$, which is the easy implication in Proposition 3.

Proposition 3 for pro-l groups is proved in [RW5] and [RW7]. The converse direction, [RW5, Proposition 2.4] yields $wL_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ where w is the unique torsion element in $\mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k)^\times)$ deflating to 1 on applying $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}$; this is extended to the l-elementary case in i) of Lemma K. Then [RW5, Theorem, p.1096] reduces the question of whether $L_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ to the analogous one for Galois extensions K/k with $G = G(K/k)$ having an abelian subgroup of index l: this carries over to the l-elementary case without change. Hence in order to deduce $w = 1$ we may thus assume that G has an abelian subgroup G' of index l, and then apply the extension in Lemma K, ii) of [loc.cit., Proposition 3.2] to l-elementary groups, to obtain the equivalence

$$w = 1 \iff \mathrm{ver}(\lambda_{K^{[G,G]}/k}) \equiv \lambda_{K/K^{G'}} \mod \mathrm{tr}_{G/G'}(\Lambda_\wedge G'),$$

in which the displayed congruence is referred to earlier as the torsion congruence. Here, $\lambda_{F/f}$ is the pseudomeasure for the extension F/f and $\mathrm{ver} : \Lambda_\wedge G^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \Lambda_\wedge G'$ is induced by the group transfer $G^{\mathrm{ab}} \to G'$. Note that the proof of Proposition 3.2 depends on the Wall congruence mentioned above. This torsion congruence is proved in [RW7] (or [RW9]) by interpreting the methods of [DR] on the Galois side as in [Se]. We point out right away that the validity of the torsion congruence persists in Proposition 6 because every open subgroup of index l in G contains $\langle z \rangle$; since $K \subset L_{S'}^+$ (in the notation of the first paragraph of §3) we can specialize the group $H_{S'}^+$ to our A. □

REMARK A. Consider the localization $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}^+]]_\bullet$ of [RW7, bottom of p.715], which results from inverting the multiplicative set of elements of $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}^+]]$ whose image in $\mathbb{Z}_l[[\Gamma_L]]$ is not in $l\mathbb{Z}_l[[\Gamma_L]]$. Observe that if $A \geq \langle z \rangle$ and $z \neq 1$, then $\hat{z} = \sum_{i=0}^{|z|-1} z^i$ has image $|z|$ in $\mathbb{Z}_l[[\Gamma_L]]$ and so is not in $l\mathbb{Z}_l[[\Gamma_L]]$, hence $\hat{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}^+]]_\bullet^\times$ and $\hat{z}(z-1) = 0$ imply $z = 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]_\bullet$. It follows that specializing $H_{S'}^+$ to A induces a map from $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}^+]]_\bullet$ to the current $\Lambda_\bullet A$ only when A is a pro-l group.

REMARK B. It should perhaps be added that $\Lambda_\bullet G = \Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$ with $\Sigma = \Lambda\Gamma \setminus l \cdot \Lambda\Gamma$ for any central open subgroup $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ of an arbitrary $G = G(K/k)$. Note that $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda\Gamma$ has the unique maximal ideal $l\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda\Gamma$. So it suffices to show that every element $c \in \Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$, which is (left) regular modulo l, is a unit of $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$. For this consider right multiplication $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G \xrightarrow{\cdot c} \Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$ by c. Since $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G/l$ is a finite dimensional $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda\Gamma/l$-vector space, $c \mod l$ has a (left) inverse in $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G/l$, hence c a left inverse b in $\Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$ by Nakayama's lemma. Since $b \mod l$ is now also (left) regular modulo l, the same argument provides $a \in \Sigma^{-1}\Lambda G$ with $ab = 1$. Then $a = abc = c$, so c is a unit.

Proposition 4, for pro-l groups, is shown in [RW8]. The restriction Res_G^U is motivated by the left square of the commutative diagram

(D2)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r, "\mathbb{L}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{res}_G^U"'] & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Tr}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_G^U"'] & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_G^U"'] \\
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge U) \arrow[r, "\mathbb{L}"] & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge U) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Tr}"] & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l U, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_{K^U})
\end{tikzcd}$$

and discussed in detail in [loc.cit., §1 and Appendix]. Its extension to l-elementary groups with $U \geq \langle z \rangle$ is again in §6; see Lemma J. $\square$

2. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5

Fix a set of coset representatives r_q of A in G, whence $G = \dot{\bigcup}_{q \in Q} r_q A$, $q = r_q A$ and $r_{q_1} r_{q_2} = r_{q_1 q_2} a_{q_1,q_2}$ with $a_{q_1,q_2} \in A$ a 2-cocycle, so $a_{q_1,q_2 q_3} a_{q_2,q_3} = a_{q_1 q_2, q_3} a_{q_1,q_2}^{q_3}$. Further, let $\Sigma = \mathrm{Sym}(Q)$ denote the symmetric group on the elements of Q. It carries the natural (right) Q-action

$$\pi^q(q_1) = \pi(q_1 q^{-1}) q \,, \quad q, q_1 \in Q \,,\, \pi \in \Sigma$$

satisfying $(\pi_1 \pi_2)^q = \pi_1^q \pi_2^q$. For $V \leq Q$, the set of fixed points Σ^V of V in Σ is thus a subgroup of Σ. Note that $\pi \in \Sigma^V$ has $\pi(qv) = \pi(q)v$ for all $q \in Q$, $v \in V$.

LEMMA A. *Let U be a subgroup of G containing A, set $V = U/A$ and fix a section $\kappa : Q/V \to Q$, so $(\kappa s)V = sV$ for $s \in Q/V$. Let $\epsilon = \sum_{q \in Q} r_q e_q$, with $e_q \in \Lambda_\wedge A$, be a unit in $\Lambda_\wedge G = \bigoplus_{q \in Q} r_q \cdot \Lambda_\wedge A$. Then*

$$\mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}_G^U \epsilon = \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma^V} \mathrm{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{q \in Q} a_{\pi(q) q^{-1}, q} \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{ver}_U^A (e^{\kappa(s)}_{\pi(\kappa s)\kappa(s)^{-1}}) \,.$$

PROOF. Writing $\Lambda_\wedge G = \bigoplus_{s \in Q/V} r_{\kappa(s)} \Lambda_\wedge U$, then

$$\epsilon r_{\kappa(s_1)} = \sum_{s_2 \in Q/V} r_{\kappa(s_2)} \Big(\sum_{v \in V} r_v a^{-1}_{\kappa(s_2),v} a_{\kappa(s_2) v \kappa(s_1)^{-1}, \kappa(s_1)} \cdot e^{\kappa(s_1)}_{\kappa(s_2) v \kappa(s_1)^{-1}} \Big)$$

(with the term in parenthesis in $\Lambda_\wedge U$). The ring homomorphism $\mathrm{ver}_U^A : \Lambda_\wedge U \to \Lambda_\wedge A$ induces the map $\mathrm{ver}_U^A : K_1(\Lambda_\wedge U) \to K_1(\Lambda_\wedge A) \overset{\det}{=} (\Lambda_\wedge A)^\times$ and we compute $\mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}_G^U \epsilon$ by applying ver_U^A to the matrix of the action of ϵ on the right $\Lambda_\wedge U$-module $\Lambda_\wedge G$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}_G^U \epsilon &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{s \in Q/V} \Big(\textstyle\sum_{v \in V} \mathrm{ver}_U^A (r_v a^{-1}_{\kappa(\sigma s), v} a_{\kappa(\sigma s) v \kappa(s)^{-1}, \kappa(s)} \cdot e^{\kappa(s)}_{\kappa(\sigma s) v \kappa(s)^{-1}}) \Big) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \sum_{f : Q/V \to V} \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{ver}_U^A \Big(r_{f(s)} a^{-1}_{\kappa(\sigma s), f(s)} a_{\kappa(\sigma s) f(s) \kappa(s)^{-1}, \kappa(s)} \cdot e^{\kappa(s)}_{\kappa(\sigma s) f(s) \kappa(s)^{-1}} \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

where f varies over all functions $Q/V \to V$, hence

$$\mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}_G^U \epsilon = \tag{2.1}$$

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)} \mathrm{sgn}(\pi) \sum_f \Big(\prod_{s \in Q/V} \prod_{v \in V} a_{f(s),v} a^{-v}_{\kappa(\sigma s), f(s)} a^{v}_{\kappa(\sigma s) f(s) \kappa(s)^{-1}, \kappa(s)} \Big) \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{ver}_U^A (e^{\kappa(s)}_{\kappa(\sigma s) f(s) \kappa(s)^{-1}})$$

because $\mathrm{ver}_U^A(r_{f(s)}) = \prod_{v\in V} a_{f(s),v}$ and $\mathrm{ver}_U^A a = \prod_{v\in V} a^v$ for $a \in A$.

We next simplify the above double product for a fixed $f : Q/V \to V$ to get

$$(2.2) \qquad \textstyle\prod_{s\in Q/V} \prod_{v\in V} a_{\kappa(\sigma s)f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1},\kappa(s)v} \,.$$

Namely, the cocycle relation for the triple $(\kappa(\sigma s), f(s), v)$,

$$a_{f(s),v}a^{-v}_{\kappa(\sigma s),f(s)} = a^{-1}_{\kappa(\sigma s),f(s)v}a_{\kappa(\sigma s)f(s),v}$$

turns the double product into

$$\prod_{s\in Q/V}\prod_{v\in V} a^{-1}_{\kappa(\sigma s),f(s)v}a_{\kappa(\sigma s)f(s),v}a^{v}_{\kappa(\sigma s)f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1},\kappa(s)} \,,$$

and from the triple $(\kappa(\sigma s)f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1}, \kappa(s), v)$ it then becomes

$$\prod_{s\in Q/V}\prod_{v\in V} a^{-1}_{\kappa(\sigma s),f(s)v}a_{\kappa(s),v}a_{\kappa(\sigma s)f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1},\kappa(s)v} \,.$$

Now the substitutions $v \rightsquigarrow f(s)^{-1}v$, $s \rightsquigarrow \sigma^{-1}(s)$ yield

$$\prod_{s\in Q/V}\prod_{v\in V} a_{\kappa(\sigma s),f(s)v} = \prod_{s\in Q/V}\prod_{v\in V} a_{\kappa(s),v} \quad \text{confirming (2.2)}\,.$$

We continue by reparametrising the maps $f : Q/V \to V$ in (2.1) in terms of the kernel Σ_0^V of the group homomorphism

$$\Sigma^V \overset{\sim}{\to} \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)\,,\ \pi \mapsto \tilde{\pi}\,,\ \tilde{\pi}(qV) = \pi(q)V\,.$$

Claim :

1. *For every* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)$ *there is a unique* $\sigma_\kappa \in \Sigma^V$ *with* $\sigma_\kappa\kappa = \kappa\sigma$*. The map* $\sigma \mapsto \sigma_\kappa : \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V) \to \Sigma^V$ *is a group homomorphism splitting* $\sim$*.*
2. *There is a bijection* $\tau \leftrightarrow f$ *between* Σ_0^V *and* $\{f : Q/V \to V\}$ *given by* $\tau(\kappa(s)v) = \kappa(s)f(s)v$, $f(s) = \kappa(s)^{-1}\tau(\kappa(s))$.
3. $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma_\kappa) = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)^{|V|} = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)$ *and* $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau) = 1$ *for all* $\tau \in \Sigma_0^V$.

Proof. If $\sigma_\kappa \in \Sigma^V$ exists, then $\sigma_\kappa(q) = \sigma_\kappa(\kappa(qV)\kappa(qV)^{-1}q) = (\sigma_\kappa\kappa)(qV)\kappa(qV)^{-1}q = \kappa(\sigma(qV))\kappa(qV)^{-1}q$ as $\kappa(qV)^{-1}q \in V$; and conversely. Finally, $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma_\kappa) = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)^{|V|}$ since $\{s_i : i \mod b\}$ a cycle of σ implies $\{\kappa(s_i)v : i \mod b\}$ is a cycle of σ_κ for each $v \in V$; and $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau) = \prod_{s\in Q/V}\mathrm{sgn}(\tau \text{ on } \kappa(s)V) = \prod_{s\in Q/V}\mathrm{sgn}(v \mapsto f(s)v \text{ on } V) = \prod_{s\in Q/V}(-1)^{|V|-[V:\langle f(s)\rangle]} = 1$. □

Note that every $q \in Q$ is a unique product $q = \kappa(s)v$ with $s \in Q/V$, $v \in V$, and every $\pi \in \Sigma^V$ is a unique product $\pi = \sigma_\kappa\tau$ with $\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}(Q/V)$, $\tau \in \Sigma_0^V$. Substituting (2.2) for the double product in (2.1) and using 2.,3. of the Claim ,

$$\begin{aligned}&\kappa(\sigma s)f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1} = \sigma_\kappa(\kappa(s))f(s)\kappa(s)^{-1} = \sigma_\kappa(\kappa(s)f(s))\kappa(s)^{-1} \\ &= \sigma_\kappa(\tau(\kappa(s)))\kappa(s)^{-1} = (\sigma_\kappa\tau)(\kappa(s))\kappa(s)^{-1} = (\sigma_\kappa\tau)(\kappa(s)v)(\kappa(s)v)^{-1} = \pi(q)q^{-1}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain the assertion of Lemma A. □

If, as before, $A \leq U \leq G$ has $V = U/A$, then, for $e \in \Lambda_\wedge A$, $\mathrm{vr}_V(e) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{ver}_U^A(e)$ defines a ring endomorphism of $\Lambda_\wedge A$ satisfying $\mathrm{vr}_V(a) = \prod_{v \in V} a^v$ for all $a \in A$. This condition determines vr_V uniquely, as A 'generates' $\Lambda_\wedge A$ additively: indeed, picking a central open $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ in A and writing $A = \dot{\bigcup}_a a\Gamma$, $\Lambda_\wedge A = \bigoplus_a a \cdot \Lambda_\wedge \Gamma$, the element e becomes $e = \sum_a a c_a$ for suitable $c_a \in \Lambda_\wedge \Gamma$ and $\mathrm{vr}_V(e) = \sum_a \mathrm{vr}_V(a) \Psi(c_a)$ with $\Psi : \Lambda_\wedge \Gamma \to \Lambda_\wedge \Gamma$ the ring homomorphism induced by $\gamma \mapsto \gamma^{|V|}$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$. In particular, we have

$$\mathrm{vr}_V(e)^q = \mathrm{vr}_{V^q}(e^q) \text{ for } V \leq Q\,,\ e \in \Lambda_\wedge A\,,\ q \in Q\,, \tag{2.3}$$

because $\mathrm{vr}_V(a)^q = \prod_{v \in V} a^{vq} = \prod_{v \in V} a^{q v^q} = \prod_{w \in V^q} a^{qw} = \mathrm{vr}_{V^q}(a^q)$ for all $a \in A$.

Lemma B. *For all $Q' \leq Q$ and all $e \in \Lambda_\wedge A$,* $\sum\limits_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod\limits_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_{Q'}(\Lambda_\wedge A)$,
where $s \in Q'/V$ now means $Q' = \dot{\bigcup}_s sV$.

Proof. We first observe that this holds for all $a \in A$ because $\mathrm{vr}_V(a^s) = \prod_{v \in V} a^{sv}$, so $\prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(a^s) = \prod_{q' \in Q'} a^{q'}$ is independent of $V \leq Q'$, and $\sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) = 0$.
It therefore suffices to prove additivity of the left side of the claimed congruence, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V((e_0 + e_1)^s)\\ &\equiv \textstyle\sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e_0^s) + \sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e_1^s) \mod \mathrm{tr}_{Q'}(\Lambda_\wedge A)\,.\end{aligned}$$

We proceed by induction on $|Q'|$; the case $Q' = 1$ is trivial.
Let $F = F(Q')$ denote the set of maps f from Q' to $\mathbb{F}_2$, with Q'-action $(fq')(x) = f(x(q')^{-1})$ for all $x \in Q'$. Then

$$\prod_{s \in Q'/V} (e_0 + e_1)^s = \sum_{f \in F^V} \prod_{s \in Q'/V} e_{f(s)}^s\,,$$

because the set of fixed points F^V of V on F is the set of all $f : Q'/V \to \mathbb{F}_2$. Defining $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(Q') = \{(V, f) : V \leq Q'\,,\ f \in F^V\}$ we have

$$\sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V((e_0 + e_1)^s) = \sum_{V \leq Q'} \mu_{Q'}(V) \sum_{f \in F^V} \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e_{f(s)}^s) = \sum_{(V,f) \in \mathfrak{F}} \tilde{\mu}(V, f)$$

where $\tilde{\mu}(V, f) = \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e_{f(s)}^s)$.

Since $f \in F^V$ implies $fq' \in F^{V^{q'}}$, $\mathfrak{F}$ becomes a Q'-set by $(V, f)^{q'} = (V^{q'}, fq')$, and we obtain that

$$\tilde{\mu}((V, f))^{q'} = \tilde{\mu}(((V, f)^{q'})$$

since, by (2.3), $\tilde{\mu}(V, f)^{q'} = \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_{V^{q'}}(e_{f(s)}^{sq'}) = \mu_{Q'}(V^{q'}) \prod_{s_1 \in Q'/V^{q'}} \mathrm{vr}_{V^{q'}}(e_{(fq')(s_1)}^{s_1}) = \tilde{\mu}(V^{q'}, fq')$, as $s_1 = sq'$ has $(fq')(s_1) = f(s)$.

We have thus reduced the claimed congruence to

$$\sum_{(V,f)\in\mathfrak{F}} \tilde{\mu}(V,f) \equiv \tilde{\mu}(V,\mathbf{0}) + \tilde{\mu}(V,\mathbf{1}) \mod \mathrm{tr}_{Q'}(\Lambda_\wedge A)$$

where $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}(Q')$ and $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}$ denote the obvious constant functions.

It now suffices to analyze, for a fixed $f \in F$, the Q'-orbit sums over $(V,f) \in \mathfrak{F}$. Set $W = \mathrm{stab}_{Q'}(f)$. Note that $W = Q'$ occurs only for $f \in F^{Q'} = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$, and then in the same way on both sides. Thus we may assume $W < Q'$ from now on.

Set $e_* = \prod_{x\in Q'/W} e^x_{f(x)} \in \Lambda_\wedge A$ for a fixed choice of coset representatives x of W in Q'. The $V \le Q'$ for which (V,f) are in $\mathfrak{F}$ are those with $f \in F^V$, i.e., $V \le W$. Observe that (V_1, f) and (V_2, f) are in the same Q'-orbit if, and only if, V_1 and V_2 are conjugate subgroups of W. So our sum of Q'-orbits involving (V,f) is [6]

$$\sum_{V\preceq W} \mathrm{tr}_{Q'/\mathrm{stab}_{Q'}(V,f)}(\tilde{\mu}(V,f))$$

where $\preceq$ means that V runs through a set of representatives of conjugacy classes of subgroups of W. Since $\mathrm{stab}_{Q'}(V,f) = \mathrm{stab}_{N_{Q'}(V)}(f) = W \cap N_{Q'}(V) = N_W(V)$, it follows that

$$\sum_{V\preceq W} \mathrm{tr}_{Q'/\mathrm{stab}_{Q'}(V,f)}(\tilde{\mu}(V,f)) = \mathrm{tr}_{Q'/W}\Big(\sum_{V\preceq W} \mathrm{tr}_{W/N_W(V)}(\tilde{\mu}(V,f)\Big)\,. \tag{2.4}$$

We next analyze $\tilde{\mu}(V,f)$ for each $V \le W$. Decomposing W as $W = \dot{\bigcup}_y yV$, hence $Q' = \dot{\bigcup}_{x,y} xyV$, we obtain

$$\prod_{s\in Q'/V} e^s_{f(s)} = \prod_{x,y} e^{xy}_{f(xy)} \doteq \prod_{y}\Big(\prod_{x} e^x_{f(x)}\Big)^y = \prod_y e^y_*$$

with $\doteq$ due to $fy^{-1} = f$. Thus

$$\tilde{\mu}(V,f) = \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{s\in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_{f(s)}) = \mu_W(V) \prod_{s\in W/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_*)\,,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}_{W/N_W(V)}\tilde{\mu}(V,f) &= \textstyle\sum_{t\in W/N_W(V)} \tilde{\mu}(V,f)^{t^{-1}} \doteq \sum_{t\in W/N_W(V)} \tilde{\mu}(V^{t^{-1}}, f)\\ &= \textstyle\sum_{t\in W/N_W(V)} \mu_W(V^{t^{-1}}) \prod_{s\in W/V^{t^{-1}}} \mathrm{vr}_{V^{t^{-1}}}(e^s_*)\end{aligned}$$

with $\doteq$ by $ft^{-1} = f$.

We substitute into our sum (2.4) to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{tr}_{Q'/W}\big(\textstyle\sum_{V\preceq W} \mathrm{tr}_{W/N_W(V)}(\tilde{\mu}(V,f)\big)\\ &= \mathrm{tr}_{Q'/W}\big(\textstyle\sum_{V\le W} \mu_W(V) \prod_{s\in W/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_*)\big) \in \mathrm{tr}_{Q'/W}(\mathrm{tr}_W(\Lambda_\wedge A)) = \mathrm{tr}_{Q'}(\Lambda_\wedge A)\,,\end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis as $W \neq Q'$. Thus, Lemma B is verified. □

---

[6] $\mathrm{tr}_{Q'/V}(e) = \sum_{s\in Q'/V} e^{s^{-1}}$, $V \le Q'$, $e \in (\Lambda_\wedge A)^V$

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 5.

In terms of the map $\mathrm{vr}_V : \Lambda_\wedge A \to \Lambda_\wedge A$ (where $V = U/A$ and $A \le U \le G$), Lemma A becomes

$$\mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}\,_G^U \epsilon = \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma^V} \tilde{r}(\pi) \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_{\pi(s)s^{-1}})$$

with $\tilde{r}(\pi) = \mathrm{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{q \in Q} a_{\pi(q)q^{-1},q} \in \Lambda_\wedge A$. Multiplying this by $\mu_Q(V)$ and summing over $V \le Q$ we obtain

$$(2.5) \quad \textstyle\sum_{V \le Q} \mu_Q(V) \mathrm{ver}_U^A \mathrm{res}\,_G^U \epsilon = \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma} \tilde{r}(\pi) \sum_{V \le \mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)} \mu_Q(V) \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_{\pi(s)s^{-1}})$$

because $[\, \pi \in \Sigma^V \iff V \le \mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)\,]$. We consider the action of conjugation of Q on this sum, starting with the

CLAIM: $\tilde{r}(\pi)^q = \tilde{r}(\pi^q)$ *for all* $q \in Q$.

PROOF. First, $\mathrm{sgn}(\pi^q) = \mathrm{sgn}(\pi)$ holds since $\{x_i : i \mod b\}$ a cycle of π implies $\{x_i q : i \mod b\}$ is a cycle of π^q. Second,

$$\begin{aligned}&(\textstyle\prod_{q_1} a_{\pi(q_1)q_1^{-1},q_1})^q = \prod_{q_1} a^q_{\pi(q_1)q_1^{-1},q_1} \overset{1}{=} \prod_{q_1} a_{\pi(q_1)q_1^{-1},q_1 q} \prod_{q_1} a^{-1}_{\pi(q_1),q} \prod_{q_1} a_{q_1,q} \\ &\overset{2}{=} \textstyle\prod_{q_1} a_{\pi(q_1)q_1^{-1},q_1 q} \overset{3}{=} \prod_{q_1} a_{\pi(q_1 q^{-1})q q_1^{-1},q_1} = \prod_{q_1} a_{\pi^q(q_1)q_1^{-1},q_1}\end{aligned}$$

with $\overset{1}{=}$ due to the cocycle relation, $\overset{2}{=}$ to π permuting the q_1 and $\overset{3}{=}$ to the substitution $q_1 \rightsquigarrow q_1 q^{-1}$. ☐

Continuing with the proof of Proposition 5, the right hand side of (2.5) is in $\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ if

$$(2.6) \qquad \textstyle\sum_{V \le \mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)} \mu_Q(V) \prod_{s \in Q/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^s_{\pi(s)s^{-1}}) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)}(\Lambda_\wedge A)$$

holds for all $\pi \in \Sigma$. Namely, assuming (2.6), its left side can be written as $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)}(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda_\wedge A$. Since $\tilde{r}(\pi) \in (\Lambda_\wedge A)^{\mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)}$, it follows that $\mathrm{tr}_{Q/\mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)}(\tilde{r}(\pi)\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)}(\alpha)) = \mathrm{tr}_Q(\tilde{r}(\pi)\alpha)$ is the orbit sum of π in (2.5), by the above CLAIM.

We next observe that (2.6) is a consequence of Lemma B. To see this, let $\pi \in \Sigma^V$ be given, set $Q' = \mathrm{stab}_Q(\pi)$ and $e = \prod_{x \in Q/Q'} e^x_{\pi(x)x^{-1}} \in \Lambda_\wedge A$, where $Q = \dot{\bigcup}_x xQ'$. Setting $Q' = \dot{\bigcup}_y yV$, then $Q = \dot{\bigcup}_{x,y} xyV$ and the V-term in (2.6) is

$$\mu_Q(V) \prod_{x,y} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^{xy}_{\pi(xy)(xy)^{-1}}) \doteq \mu_Q(V) \prod_{x,y} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^{xy}_{\pi(x)x^{-1}}) = \mu_{Q'}(V) \prod_{y \in Q'/V} \mathrm{vr}_V(e^y)$$

where $\doteq$ results from $\pi^y = \pi$.

Collecting everything so far, we see that Proposition 5 follows from (2.6), and that this holds because of Lemma B. ☐

3. DERIVING PROPOSITION 6 FROM [RW9]

For Proposition 6 we identify the field L in [RW9] with the fixed field K^A of the given abelian normal open subgroup A in $G = G(K/k)$; so L is a Galois extension of k with group Q and the intermediate fields f in L/k correspond to the subgroups U/A of Q [7]. Set $G_{S'} = G(k_{S'}/k)$, $H_{S'} = G(L_{S'}/L)$ [8]. Note that the cyclotomic $\mathbb{Z}_l$-extension L_∞ of L is contained in $L^+_{S'}$ and abbreviate $G(L_\infty/L)$ by Γ_L.

Let λ be a pseudomeasure on $H_{S'}$ in the language of [Se], i.e., an element of the total ring of fractions of the commutative ring $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ so that $(1-h)\lambda$ is in $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ for all $h \in H_{S'}$.

Lemma c. *There is a unique pseudomeasure λ^A on A so that $(1-a)\lambda^A$ is the image, under $H_{S'} \twoheadrightarrow A$, of $(1-h)\lambda$ for every $h \in H_{S'}$ with image a. Moreover, λ^A is in $\Lambda_\bullet A$.*

We call λ^A the deflation $\mathrm{defl}^A_{H_{S'}}(\lambda)$ of the pseudomeasure λ. Note that if λ is Serre's pseudomeasure λ_L, then $\lambda^A_L = \lambda_{K/L}$.

Proof. Pick an element $h \in H_{S'}$ with non-trivial image under $H_{S'} \to \Gamma_L$. Let Γ_h be the subgroup of $H_{S'}$ topologically generated by h and $M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ the localization of $\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ by inverting the multiplicative set $M_h = \mathbb{Z}_l[[\Gamma_h]] \setminus l\mathbb{Z}_l[\Gamma_h]]$. Then $\lambda \in M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ because $(1-h)\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$. The natural map $\mathrm{defl}^A_{H_{S'}} : \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_l[[A]] = \Lambda A$ induces $\mathrm{defl}^A_{H_{S'}}$: $M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]] \xrightarrow{\eta_h} \Lambda_\bullet A$. Note that $\Lambda_\bullet A$ is independent, as a subring of $\mathcal{Q}A$, of the choice of h, by Remark B.

Then $\eta_h(\lambda) \in \Lambda_\bullet A$ is independent of the choice of h as above, for if h' is another then, with a the image of h under $H_{S'} \twoheadrightarrow A$, $(1-a)\eta_h(\lambda) = \eta_h((1-h)\lambda) \doteq \eta_{h'}((1-h)\lambda) = (1-a)\eta_{h'}(\lambda)$, with $\doteq$ due to $(1-a)\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$. Thus $\eta_h(\lambda) = \eta_{h'}(\lambda)$ because $1-a \in (\Lambda_\bullet A)^\times$. This common image is λ^A.

Finally, λ^A is a pseudomeaure on A for, if $a \in A$ then, choosing a preimage $h \in H_{S'}$ for a, we have $(1-h)\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$ mapping to $(1-a)\lambda^A$ in ΛA. Thus, Lemma c is shown. $\square$

The Theorem in [RW9] says that there exists a $g \in G_{S'}$, with g_f having image $\neq 1$ in Γ_f for $k \subseteq f \subseteq L$, so that

$$\textstyle\sum_{k\subseteq f\subseteq L} \mu_Q(G(L/f))\mathrm{ver}^L_f(\tilde{\lambda}_{g_f}) \tag{3.1}$$

has image in $\mathrm{tr}_Q(\mathbb{Z}_l[[H^+_{S'}]]$, under $\mathrm{defl}^{H^+_{S'}}_{H_{S'}} : \mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]] \to \mathbb{Z}_l[[H^+_{S'}]]$.

We first remove the ˜ on λ_{g_f} in (3.1). Recall that $\tilde{\lambda}_f = 2^{-[f:\mathbb{Q}]}\lambda_f$ implies $\tilde{\lambda}_{g_f} = 2^{-[f:\mathbb{Q}]}\lambda_{g_f}$. So it suffices to show

$$\mu_Q(G(L/f))2^{-[f:\mathbb{Q}]} \equiv \mu_Q(G(L/f))2^{-[L:\mathbb{Q}]} \mod |Q| \,,$$

and this congruence in turn is a consequence of $|Q|$ being a power of $l \neq 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_Q(G(L/f))(2^{-[f:\mathbb{Q}]} - 2^{-[L:\mathbb{Q}]}) = 2^{-[L:\mathbb{Q}]}\mu_Q(G(L/f))\Big((2^{[L:f]-1})^{[f:\mathbb{Q}]} - 1\Big)\,,\\
&2^{[L:f]-1} \equiv 1 \mod l \quad \text{by } 2^l \equiv 2 \mod l\,, \text{ so } \quad (2^{[L:f]-1})^{[f:\mathbb{Q}]} \equiv 1 \mod l[f:\mathbb{Q}]\,,
\end{aligned}$$

---

[7] our k is thus the field K of [loc.cit.]

[8] If Leopoldt's conjecture fails, then these groups are not of our type, though abelian.

so it now suffices to show that $\mu_Q(G(L/f))l[f:\mathbb{Q}]$ is divisible by $|Q| = [L:k]$. Due to [HIÖ, Corollary 3.5], $\mu_Q(G(L/f))l$ is divisible by $[L:f]$, whence $\mu_Q(G(L/f))l[f:\mathbb{Q}]$ by $[L:f][f:\mathbb{Q}] = [L:\mathbb{Q}]$.

Next, setting $h = \mathrm{ver}_k^L g = \mathrm{ver}_f^L \mathrm{ver}_k^f g = \mathrm{ver}_f^L g_f$, we have $(1-g_f)\lambda_f = \lambda_{g_f} \in \mathbb{Z}_l[[G(f_{S'}/f)]]$ implying that

$$\lambda_f \in M_{g_f}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[G(f_{S'}/f)]]$$

(in the notation of the proof of Lemma C) hence

$$\mathrm{ver}_f^L(\lambda_f) \in M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$$

because $\mathrm{ver}_f^L = \mathrm{ver}_{G(L_{S'}/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{H_{S'}} = \mathrm{ver}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{H_{S'}}$. Thus

$$\sum_{k\subseteq f\subseteq L} \mu_Q(G(L/f))\mathrm{ver}_f^L((1-g_f)\lambda_f) = (1-h)\sum_{k\subseteq f\subseteq L}\mu_Q(G(L/f))\mathrm{ver}_f^L(\lambda_f)$$

implies that every term of the second sum is in $M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]]$. Applying $\mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^A = \mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}^+}^A \mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^{H_{S'}^+}$ to (3.1) then yields that

$$\textstyle\sum_{k\subseteq f\subseteq L}\mu_Q(G(L/f))\mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^A\mathrm{ver}_f^L(\lambda_f) \tag{3.2}$$

is in $\mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}^+}^A(\mathrm{tr}_Q(M_{h^+}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]])) = \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\bullet A)$, where $h^+ = \mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^{H_{S'}^+}h$.

In order to derive Proposition 6 from this we set $U = G(K/f)$ and show that

$$\mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^A\mathrm{ver}_f^L = \mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^A\mathrm{ver}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{H_{S'}} = \mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A\mathrm{defl}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} . \tag{3.3}$$

Here, the second equality follows from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G(L_{S'}/K) \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d, equal] & G(L_{S'}/f) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, phantom, "\cup"] & G(K/f) \arrow[d, phantom, "\cup"] \\
G(L_{S'}/K) \arrow[r, tail] & G(L_{S'}/L) \arrow[r, two heads] & G(K/L)
\end{tikzcd}$$

allowing transfers to be computed by using corresponding coset representatives, giving

$$\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/L)}^{G(K/L)}\mathrm{ver}_{G(L_{S'}/f)}^{G(L_{S'}/L)} = \mathrm{ver}_{G(K/f)}^{G(K/L)}\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/f)}^{G(K/f)} .$$

Factoring the transfers through the abelianisations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/L)}^{G(K/L)}\mathrm{ver}_{G(L_{S'}/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{G(L_{S'}/L)}\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/f)}^{G(L_{S'}/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}} = \mathrm{ver}_{G(K/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{G(K/L)}\mathrm{defl}_{G(K/f)}^{G(K/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/f)}^{G(K/f)} \\
&= \mathrm{ver}_{G(K/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{G(K/L)}\mathrm{defl}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{G(K/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{defl}_{G(L_{S'}/f)}^{G(L_{S'}/f)^{\mathrm{ab}}}
\end{aligned}$$

and cancelling the (surjective) maps on the right gives (3.3).

Combining (3.2) with the commutative square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_{g_f}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[G(f_{S'}/f)]] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{ver}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{H_{S'}}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{defl}_{G(f_{S'}/f)}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}"'] & M_h^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_l[[H_{S'}]] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{defl}_{H_{S'}}^A"] \\
\Lambda_\bullet U^{\mathrm{ab}} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A"] & \Lambda_\bullet A
\end{tikzcd} ,$$

which follows from (3.3), we get the statement of the proposition, by applying Lemma c and $U^{\mathrm{ab}} = G(K^{[U,U]}/K^U)$. □

4. Proof of Theorem 7

We fix some notation. A is an abelian normal open subgroup of $G = G(K/k) = \langle z\rangle \times G[l]$ containing $\langle z\rangle$ with factor group $Q = G/A$, and Γ , C are central subgroups of G contained in A, with $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ open and C of exponent l. Further, $U \leq G$ is open and contains C and $\langle z\rangle$.

Recall that Res_G^U satisfies diagram (D2) and is discussed in §6 and [RW8, Proposition A]. In particular, we know that 'Res' is additive, transitive and that it preserves integrality. Also, if $g \in G$, then conjugation by g canonically induces maps $\Lambda_\wedge U \to \Lambda_\wedge U^g$ and $T(\Lambda_\wedge U) \to T(\Lambda_\wedge U^g)$, the latter by $\tau_U(u)^g = \tau_{U^g}(u^g)$ for $u \in U$ [9].

Lemma d. *1. If $[G:U] = l$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$, $g \in G$ we have*

$$\mathrm{Res}_G^U(\alpha\tau_G(g)) = \begin{cases} \alpha\sum_{x\in G/U}\tau_U(g^x) & \text{if } g \in U \\ \Psi(\alpha)\tau_U(g^l) & \text{if } g \notin U\,, \end{cases}$$

where $\Psi : \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma \to \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$ is the continuous $\mathbb{Z}_l$-linear ring homomorphism induced by $\gamma \mapsto \gamma^l$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

2. For $g \in G$, $c \in C$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$,

$$\mathrm{Res}_G^U(\alpha\tau_G(g(c-1))) = \alpha\sum_{x\in G/U}\dot{\tau}_U(g^x(c-1))$$

with $x \in G/U$ meaning $G = \dot{\bigcup}_x xU$ and $\dot{\tau}_U : \Lambda_\wedge G \to T(\Lambda_\wedge U)$ defined by extending τ_U to take the value 0 outside of $\Lambda_\wedge U$.

3. Let $V \leq U$ be open subgroups of G containing $\langle z\rangle$ and let $g \in G$, $w \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$. Then $(\mathrm{Res}_U^V w)^g = \mathrm{Res}_{U^g}^{V^g}(w^g)$.

Proof. For $\alpha \in \Gamma$ the claimed formula 1. is already given at the bottom of [loc.cit.,p.127]; additivity and continuity then implies it in general.

For 2., we first remark that $\sum_{x\in G/U}\dot{\tau}(g^x(c-1))$ is independent of a special choice of coset representatives x of U in G and on replacing g by g^s for $s \in G$. We proceed by induction on $[G:U]$. If $U < G$, choose $U \leq G' < G$, $[G:G'] = l$, so $G' \lhd G$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Res}_G^U(\alpha\tau_G(g(c-1))) = \mathrm{Res}_{G'}^U\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'}(\alpha\tau_G(g(c-1))) \\ &= \mathrm{Res}_{G'}^U\Big(\begin{cases} \alpha\sum_{x''\in G/G'}\tau_{G'}(g^{x''}(c-1)) & \text{if } g \in G' \\ \Psi(\alpha)\tau_{G'}((g^{x''}c)^l - (g^{x''})^l) & \text{if} g \notin G' \end{cases}\Big) \\ &= \begin{cases} \sum_{x''\in G/G'}\mathrm{Res}_{G'}^U\alpha\tau_{G'}(g^{x''}(c-1)) & \text{if } g \in G' \\ 0 & \text{if } g \notin G'\,. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

---

[9] $\tau_U : \Lambda_\wedge U \to T(\Lambda_\wedge U)$ is the natural map.

In the first case, the induction hypothesis turns this into

$$\alpha \sum_{x''\in G/G'} \sum_{x'\in G'/U} \dot\tau_U(g^{x''x'}(c-1)) = \alpha \sum_{x\in G/U} \dot\tau_U(g^x(c-1))\,,$$

as required. In the second case, when $g \notin G'$, we must show that the right hand side of the assertion is zero, which however is clear since $g^x \in U$ implies $g^x \in G'$, hence $g \in G'$. This finishes the proof of 2.

For 3., choose a sequence of subgroups $V = V_0 < V_1 < \cdots < V_n = U$ with $[V_{i+1} : V_i] = l\,,\ 0 \leq i \leq n-1$, and then combine transitivity of 'Res' with induction on n to arrive at

$$(\mathrm{Res}^V_U w)^g = (\mathrm{Res}^V_{V_1}(\mathrm{Res}^{V_1}_U w))^g \overset{!}{=} \mathrm{Res}^{V^g}_{V_1^g}((\mathrm{Res}^{V_1}_U w)^g) = \mathrm{Res}^{V^g}_{V_1^g}(\mathrm{Res}^{V_1^g}_{U^g} w^g) = \mathrm{Res}^{V^g}_{U^g}(w^g)\,,$$

in which the equality $\overset{!}{=}$ still needs to be verified. However, here we are in the index l case, so $V^g \lhd V_1^g$, and we can apply 1.

Lemma D is established. □

Lemma E. *Denote the map $G \to G/C$ by $\overline{}$ and define $\mathfrak{a}\,,\ \mathfrak{b}$ by*

$$\mathfrak{a} \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge G \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge \overline{G} \quad \text{respectively} \quad \mathfrak{b} \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge A \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge \overline{A}\ .$$

Then

i. $\mathfrak{b}^Q/\mathrm{tr}_Q\mathfrak{b} \to (\Lambda_\wedge A)^Q/\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ *is injective,*

ii. $\tau_G(\mathfrak{a}) \rightarrowtail T(\Lambda_\wedge G) \twoheadrightarrow T(\Lambda_\wedge \overline{G})$ *is exact and* $\mathit{Res}^A_G \tau_G(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathrm{tr}_Q\mathfrak{b}\,.$

Proof. Applying Tate-cohomology to the sequence defining $\mathfrak{b}$, we see that the claimed injectivity i. is a consequence of $H^{-1}(Q, \Lambda_\wedge\overline{A}) = 0$. In order to see this vanishing, choose a central open $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ of $\overline{G}$ contained in $\overline{A}$ and pick Q-orbit representatives $a_i\Gamma$ of $\overline{A}/\Gamma$. Set $Q_i = \mathrm{stab}_Q(a_i\Gamma)$. For $q_i \in Q_i$, $a_i^{q_i-1} \in \Gamma$ has finite order, hence $a_i^{q_i} = a_i$, i.e., $Q_i = \mathrm{stab}_Q(a_i)$. Hence we have a set of representatives of Γ in $\overline{A}$ consisting of Q-orbits $Q_i\backslash Q$ for some $Q_i \leq Q$ and consequently, [RW3, Lemma 5],

$$H^{-1}(Q, \Lambda_\wedge\overline{A}) = \bigoplus_i H^{-1}(Q, \mathrm{ind}\,^Q_{Q_i}(\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma)) = \bigoplus_i H^{-1}(Q_i, \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma) = 0\,,$$

as $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$ has $\mathbb{Z}_l$-torsion $= 0$.

For the first claim in ii. we only need to check exactness at the middle, or, more precisely, that $\mathrm{defl}^{\overline{G}}_G \tau_G(v) = 0$ implies $\tau_G(v) \in \tau_G(\mathfrak{a})$. Now, $\mathrm{defl}^{\overline{G}}_G(v) = \sum_i [\overline{w}_i, \overline{x}_i]$ with $w_i, x_i \in \Lambda_\wedge G$ implies that $v - \sum_i [w_i, x_i] \in \ker \mathrm{defl}^{\overline{G}}_G = \mathfrak{a}$, so apply τ_G and arrive at $\tau_G(v) \in \tau_G(\mathfrak{a})$.

Regarding the second claim of ii., the elements of $\mathfrak{a}$ are $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-linear combinations of $\tau_G(g(c-1))$. By 2. of Lemma D Res^A_G of this equals $\sum_{x\in G/A} \dot\tau_A(g^x(c-1)) = \mathrm{tr}_Q(g(c-1))$ if $g \in A$ and 0 if $g \notin A$; note that the $g(c-1)\,,\ g \in A\,,\ c \in C$ generate $\mathfrak{b}$ as $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-module.

This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

LEMMA F. *Notation as in Lemma* E, *we have* $\mathbb{L}(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\mathfrak{b}) \subset \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$.

PROOF. Let $\beta = \sum_{a\in A, c\in C} \beta_{a,c}a(c-1)$ be an element in $\mathfrak{b}$, where $\beta_{a,c} \in \Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$ for some central open $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ contained in A. Now

$$\mathbb{L}(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta) = \frac{1}{l}\,\log\,\frac{(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l}{\Psi(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)}\ ,$$

by the argument given in [RW3,pp.39/40], which also works in the situation when the unit u to which $\mathbb{L}$ is applied (see [loc.cit.,p.39,(∗)]) is in $\Lambda_\wedge A$ rather than in $\Lambda\Gamma$ (the ring $\mathfrak{O}$ there is $\mathbb{Z}_l$ here, so the Frobenius automorphism Fr is trivial). The point is that in [loc.cit.,p.40,(∗∗)] we are on the A-level and so we still need only consider degree 1 characters.

So $\mathbb{L}(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta) \in \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ if $\frac{(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l}{\Psi(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)} \equiv 1 \mod l\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$. Since $(1+\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l \equiv 1+(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l \mod l\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$, it suffices to show that $(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l \equiv \Psi(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta) \mod l\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$.

Now, as $\Psi(a) = a^l$ for $a \in A$ [loc.cit.,p.33], $\Psi(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta) = \sum_{a,c}\Psi(\beta_{a,c})(\mathrm{tr}_Q((ac)^l) - \mathrm{tr}_Q(a^l)) = 0$, since $(ac)^l = a^lc^l = a^l$, and we are left to check that $(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l \equiv 0 \mod l\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$. But $\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta = \sum_c \kappa_c(c-1)$ with $\kappa_c = \mathrm{tr}_Q(\sum_a \beta_{a,c}a) \in \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$, so

$$(\mathrm{tr}_Q\beta)^l \equiv \sum_c \kappa_c^l(c-1)^l \mod l\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$$

as $\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ is an ideal in $(\Lambda_\wedge A)^Q$ and $c \in (\Lambda_\wedge A)^Q$. Thus, $(c-1)^l \equiv 0 \mod l(\Lambda_\wedge A)^Q$ establishes Lemma F. □

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 7.

If U is an open subgroup of G containing $\langle z\rangle$ and N a finite normal subgroup of U, we write $t_{U/N}$ for t_{K^N/K^U}; similarly, we write λ_A for $\lambda_{K/K^A} \in (\Lambda_\wedge A)^\times = K_1(\Lambda_\wedge A)$. We recall from [RW8, Lemma 2] and [RW5, Lemma 2.1] that $\mathrm{Res}_G^U t_G = t_U$, $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U/N} t_U = t_{U/N}$, in this notation.

As above, denote going modulo C by $^-$, so $\overline{G} = G/C$. Also recall the short exact sequences

$$\mathfrak{a} \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge G \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge\overline{G} \quad , \quad \mathfrak{b} \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge A \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge\overline{A}\,.$$

For the definitions to follow we use the commutative square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\Lambda_\wedge G)^\times \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, two heads] & (\Lambda_\wedge\overline{G})^\times \arrow[d, two heads] \\
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r] & K_1(\Lambda_\wedge\overline{G})
\end{tikzcd}$$

in which the (natural) vertical maps are surjective, since $\Lambda_\wedge G$, $\Lambda_\wedge\overline{G}$ are semi-local rings. Moreover, the top horizontal map is surjective as well, because $\ker(\Lambda_\wedge G \to \Lambda_\wedge\overline{G}) \subset \mathrm{rad}(\Lambda_\wedge G)$.

By Proposition 3, $t_{\overline{G}} \in T(\Lambda_\wedge\overline{G})$ implies $L_{K^C/k} = \mathrm{Det}\,\theta$ with $\theta \in K_1(\Lambda_\wedge\overline{G})$. Observe that $\mathrm{res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{A}}\theta = \lambda_{\overline{A}}$, because

$$\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{A}}\theta) = \mathrm{res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{A}}(\mathrm{Det}\theta) = \mathrm{res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{A}}(L_{K^C/k}) = L_{K^C/K^A} = \mathrm{Det}\lambda_{\overline{A}}$$

and $SK_1(\Lambda_\wedge \overline{A}) = 1$, as $\Lambda_\wedge \overline{A}$ is commutative semilocal [CR, (45.12)].

The above square gives a $\vartheta \in K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ with $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\vartheta = \theta$. Define $\vartheta' \in K_1(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ by $\mathrm{res}\,_G^A\vartheta = \lambda_A\vartheta'$, hence $\mathrm{defl}_A^{\overline{A}}\vartheta' = 1$.

Further define $\xi = \mathbb{L}(\vartheta)\,,\ \xi' = \mathbb{L}(\vartheta')$. Then, using diagrams (D1) and (D2), $\xi \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ has $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\xi = t_{\overline{G}}$, $\mathrm{Res}_G^A\xi = t_A + \xi'$ and $\mathrm{defl}_A^{\overline{A}}\xi' = 0$.

The exact sequences displayed above give rise to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tau_G(\mathfrak{a}) \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d] & T(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_G^A"'] & T(\Lambda_\wedge \overline{G}) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{A}}"'] \\
\mathfrak{b} \arrow[r, tail] & \Lambda_\wedge A \arrow[r, two heads] & \Lambda_\wedge \overline{A}
\end{tikzcd}$$

with top sequence exact by Lemma E. We need to modify ξ by adding an element $\alpha \in \tau_G(\mathfrak{a})$ (so without changing $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\xi$) to arrange that $\mathrm{Res}_G^A(\xi + \alpha) = t_A$, i.e., we need to prove that $\xi' \in \mathrm{Res}_G^A(\tau_G(\mathfrak{a}))$.

Now, λ_A is Q-invariant, by the proof of [RW5, Lemma 3.1], and $\mathrm{res}\,_G^A$ takes Q-invariant values, whence $\vartheta' \in 1 + \mathfrak{b}^Q$. We claim that

$$\vartheta' \in 1 + \mathrm{tr}_Q\mathfrak{b}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Write $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{res}\,_G^U\vartheta = \lambda_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\vartheta'_U$ for $A \leq U \leq G$. Then $\vartheta'_U \in K_1(\Lambda_\wedge U^{\mathrm{ab}}) = (\Lambda_\wedge U^{\mathrm{ab}})^\times$ has $\mathrm{defl}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{U/[U,U]\cdot C}\vartheta'_U = 1$ because

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_{U/[U,U]C}\mathrm{defl}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{U/[U,U]C}(\vartheta'_U) = \mathrm{defl}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{U/[U,U]C}\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{res}\,_G^U\vartheta = \mathrm{defl}_{\overline{U}}^{U/[U,U]C}\mathrm{defl}_U^{\overline{U}}\mathrm{res}\,_G^U\vartheta \\
&= \mathrm{defl}_{\overline{U}}^{U/[U,U]C}\mathrm{res}\,_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{U}}\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\vartheta = \mathrm{defl}_{\overline{U}}^{U/[U,U]C}\mathrm{res}\,_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{U}}\theta = \lambda_{U/[U,U]C}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

with the last equality by $SK_1(\Lambda_\wedge U/[U,U]C) = 1$, as before.

Summing up, $\vartheta'_U \in \ker(\,(\Lambda_\wedge U^{\mathrm{ab}})^\times \to (\Lambda_\wedge U^{U/[U,U]\cdot C})^\times\,)$ so $\vartheta'_U = 1 + \alpha$ where α is a $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-linear combination of elements $\tilde{u}(\tilde{c} - 1)$ with $u \in U$, $c \in C$ and $\tilde{}\ : U \to U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ the canonical map (with $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ some central open subgroup of G contained in A). Then, if $A < U$, $\mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A$ takes c to $c^{[U:A]} = 1$ and thus $\tilde{u}(\tilde{c} - 1)$ to zero. As a first result we therefore have

$$U \neq A \implies \mathrm{ver}_U^A\mathrm{res}\,_G^U\vartheta = \lambda_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\ .$$

Now insert ϑ into the "Möbius-Wall" congruence of Proposition 5 and obtain

$$\lambda_A\vartheta' + \sum_{A < U \leq G}\mu_Q(U/A)\mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A\lambda_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)\ .$$

Comparing this [10] with the abelian pseudomeasure congruence

$$\sum_{A \leq U \leq G}\mu_Q(U/A)\mathrm{ver}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^A(\lambda_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$$

---

[10] It is only here that Propositions 5 and 6 make their appearance.

of Proposition 6 gives $\vartheta' \equiv 1 \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$, as λ_A is a unit in $(\Lambda_\wedge A)^Q$ and $\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ an ideal. Therefore

$$\vartheta' \in (1+\mathfrak{b}^Q) \cap (1+\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)) = 1 + (\mathfrak{b}^Q \cap \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)) = 1 + \mathrm{tr}_Q\mathfrak{b}\,,$$

with the last equality due to Lemma E. This proves our claim (4.1).

Turning back to the proof of the theorem, we know that $\xi' = \mathbb{L}(\vartheta')$ is in $\mathfrak{b}^Q$. By the claim and Lemma F, we also have $\xi' \in \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A)$ hence $\xi' \in \mathfrak{b}^Q \cap \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge A) = \mathrm{tr}_Q(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathrm{Res}^A_G(\tau_G(\mathfrak{a}))$, by Lemma E.

Thus the proof of Theorem 7 is complete. □

5. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

Recall the notation of the beginning of §4, so $G = G(K/k) = \langle z\rangle \times G[l]$ is l-elementary, with $\langle z\rangle$ a finite cyclic group of order prime to l and $G[l]$ a pro-l group, and A is an abelian normal open subgroup of G containing $\langle z\rangle$.

We define $\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ by the exact sequence $0 \to \mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \Lambda_\wedge(U^{\mathrm{ab}}) \to \Lambda_\wedge(U/C[U,U]) \to 0$.

LEMMA G. *Let C have order l and $U \geq A$ satisfy $C \cap [U,U] = 1$. Denote the normalizer of U in G by $N = N_G(U)$ and let Y be a set of representatives of N/U-orbits in $U/\Gamma C[U,U]$. Then $\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}})$ has $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis*

$$\{\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}(\tilde{c}-1)) : y \in Y_1,\ 1 \neq c \in C\}$$

where Y_1 is the set of $y \in Y$ that have preimage $\tilde{y}$ in $U/[U,U]$ which is fixed by $\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(y)$, and $\tilde{c}$ is the image of $c \in C$ in $U/[U,U]$.

For the proof, we use $C \cap [U,U] = 1 = \Gamma \cap [U,U]$ to identify C, Γ with their images in U^{ab} (hence c with $\tilde{c}$). We investigate the N/U-structure of $0 \to \mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \Lambda_\wedge U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \Lambda_\wedge(U^{\mathrm{ab}}/C) \to 0$ via the $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-bases coming from the N/U-action on $C \rightarrowtail U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma \twoheadrightarrow U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma C$ by [RW3, Lemma 5].

Now Y is a set of representatives of N/U-orbits on $U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma C$. If $\hat{y}$ is a preimage of $y \in Y$ under $U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma \to U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma C$ then $\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(y)$ either fixes $\hat{y}$ (in case 1) or moves $\hat{y}$ (in case 2); moreover this case distinction is independent of the choice of $\hat{y}$. This permits us to analyze the map $\Lambda_\wedge U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \Lambda_\wedge(U^{\mathrm{ab}}/C)$ one $y \in Y$ at a time in terms of the map of N/U-sets from the preimage of the N/U-orbit of y to the N/U-orbit of y it induces. This is because of the permutation $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis given by choosing preimages $\tilde{y}$ of $\hat{y}$ under $U^{\mathrm{ab}} \to U^{\mathrm{ab}}/\Gamma$ with $\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}) = \mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(\hat{y})$, as in the proof of Lemma E.

Thus, in case 1, the preimage of the N/U-orbit of y is $\dot{\bigcup}_{c\in C}(N/U\text{-orbit of } \hat{y}c)$, so l copies of $\frac{N/U}{\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(y)}$ as N/U-sets, and the map is $\hat{y}^n c \mapsto y^n$ for $n \in N, c \in C$. So the kernel on $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-permutation modules has $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis $\{\tilde{y}^n(c-1) : n \in \frac{N/U}{\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(y)}\,,\ 1 \neq c \in C\}$.

Similarly, in case 2, the preimage of the N/U-orbit of y is the N/U-orbit of $\hat{y}:$ here $\hat{y}^z = \hat{y}\gamma_y(z)$, with γ_y a homomorphism $\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(y) \twoheadrightarrow C$, has $\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(\hat{y})$ as its kernel. Now the kernel on $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-permutation modules has $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis $\{\tilde{y}^n - \tilde{y} : n \in \frac{N/U}{\mathrm{stab}_{N/U}(\hat{y})}\}$.

Hence $\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ has $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis the union of these over $y \in Y$, and $\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}})$ has the claimed $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$-basis since Y_1 consists of the $y \in Y$ in case 1 and $\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}^n - \tilde{y}) = 0$ for all $y \in Y$ in case 2. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma h. *If $v \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ has $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^U v = 0$ for all subgroups U of G containing A, then $v = 0$.*

The proof is by induction on $[G : A]$. Fix a central open $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ in A and an n so that $l^n \equiv 1$ mod $|z|$ and l^n is an exponent of $G[l]/\Gamma$. By the diagram of ii) of Lemma i and $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} v = 0$, there is an $\omega \in K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ so that $\mathbb{L}(\omega) = v$ and $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}\omega$ is a torsion element (e.g. 1) of $K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G^{\mathrm{ab}})$.

Consider $\mathrm{Res}_G^U v$ with $U \geq A$ having index l in G. Then $\mathrm{defl}_V^{V^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_U^V(\mathrm{Res}_G^U v) = \mathrm{defl}_V^{V^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^V v = 0$ so the induction hypothesis yields $\mathrm{Res}_G^U v = 0$. Thus $\mathbb{L}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega) = \mathrm{Res}_G^U(\mathbb{L}\omega) = 0$ implies $\mathbf{L}(\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{L}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega)) = 0$, hence $\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega)(\chi_1)^l = \Psi((\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega))(\psi_l\chi_1)$ for all characters χ_1 of U, by the definition of $\mathbf{L}$.

If χ_1 is an irreducible character of U with kernel containing Γ then $\chi_1 = \beta \otimes \varpi$ with β, ϖ irreducible characters of U with kernels containing $U[l]$, $\langle z\rangle\Gamma$, respectively. Note that $\psi_l^n\chi_1 = \psi_l^n\beta \otimes \psi_l^n\varpi = \beta \otimes 1 = \beta$, hence

$$(\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega)(\chi_1)^{l^n} = \Psi^n(\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega)(\psi_l^n\chi_1)) = \Psi^n((\mathrm{res}_G^U(\mathrm{Det}\omega))(\beta)) = \Psi^n((\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\mathrm{ind}_U^G\beta))$$

is torsion. This holds because $U \triangleleft G$ l-elementary implies that $\beta = \mathrm{res}_G^U\beta'$ where $\beta' = \mathrm{infl}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^G\beta''$ hence $\mathrm{ind}_U^G\beta = \beta'\mathrm{ind}_U^G 1$ and $\mathrm{ind}_U^G 1 = \sum_{i=1}^l \alpha_i$ with α_i the irreducible characters of G having $\mathrm{res}_G^U\alpha_i = 1$; now $\alpha_i = \mathrm{infl}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^G\alpha_i'$ so

$$(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\mathrm{ind}_U^G\beta) = (\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\sum_{i=1}^l \beta'\alpha_i) = \prod_{i=1}^l(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\mathrm{infl}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^G(\beta''\alpha_i')) = \prod_{i=1}^l \mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}\omega)(\beta''\alpha_i')$$

is torsion. Thus $(\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{res}_G^U\omega))(\chi_1)$ is torsion for all such χ_1 and $U \geq A$ of index l in G.

Now if χ is one of the finitely many irreducible characters of G with $\Gamma \subseteq \ker(\chi)$ then (by Clifford theory), either $\chi = \mathrm{ind}_U^G\chi_1$ with $U \geq A$ of index l when $(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\chi) = (\mathrm{res}_G^U(\mathrm{Det}\omega))(\chi_1)$ is torsion, or $\chi = \mathrm{infl}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^G\alpha$ when $(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\chi) = \mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}\omega)(\alpha)$ is again torsion. Every irreducible character of G has the form $\chi \otimes \rho$ with such a χ and ρ of type W hence $(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\chi \otimes \rho) = \rho^\sharp((\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\chi))$ torsion of order at most that of $(\mathrm{Det}\omega)(\chi)$. Thus $\mathrm{Det}\omega$ is a torsion element in $\mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma_k)^\times)$ and so $\mathrm{Tr}(v) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{L}\omega) = \mathbf{L}(\mathrm{Det}\omega) = 0$ implies $v = 0$. □

Remark C. When G is abelian pro-l, Proposition 5.1 of [RW6] gives a description of the kernel of $\mathbb{L}$ on $(\Lambda_\wedge G)^\times$. This can be (and originally was) used to prove the lemma for pro-l groups. The present proof is shorter for l-elementary groups than extending that proposition from $\Lambda_\wedge$ to $\Lambda_\wedge^\beta$ (for the notation compare the proof of Lemma i).

We next state the

Uniqueness Principle. *If* $\xi \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ *has* $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi = t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}$ *for all subgroups* U *of* G *containing a fixed abelian normal open subgroup* A *of* G*, then* $\xi = t_G$*. In particular,* $t_G \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$*.*

This is because $l^n t_G$ is integral for large enough natural n (see [RW4, Proposition 9]). Setting $v = l^n t_G - l^n\xi$ we see that $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^U v = l^n t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} - l^n t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} = 0$, so $v = l^n(t_G - \xi) = 0$ by Lemma H. However, $T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ is torsionfree as 'Tr' is injective. $\square$

Now, were the Theorem false, there would exist an extension K/k for which the Galois group G would have commutator subgroup $[G,G]$ of *minimal* order; among these groups G there would be one with centre $Z(G)$ of *minimal* index $[G : Z(G)]$.

Since $[G,G] \neq 1$, by [RW3, Theorem 9], and $[G,G]$ is an l-group as G is l-elementary we may choose a central subgroup $C \leq [G,G]$ of order l in G, and then a *maximal* abelian normal subgroup A of G, necessarily containing C and $\langle z\rangle$. We also fix a central open $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l$ inside A. Now Theorem 7 guarantees the existence of

$$\xi \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G) \text{ with } \mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\xi = t_{\overline{G}} \text{ and } \mathrm{Res}_G^A\xi = t_A\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where, as before, $^{-}$ denotes going modulo C. To defeat the counterexample G it suffices, by the Uniqueness Principle, to find such a ξ so that $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi = t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}$ for all subgroups $U \geq A$ of G. Observe that this already holds for U with $[U,U] \geq C$: for then $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi = \mathrm{defl}_{U/C}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{defl}_U^{U/C}\mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi = \mathrm{defl}_{\overline{U}}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{U}}\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\xi = \mathrm{defl}_{\overline{U}}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\mathrm{Res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{U}}t_{\overline{G}} = t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}$.
On the other hand, for $U \geq A$ with $[U,U] \ngeq C$, hence $C \cap [U,U] = 1$, then $|[U,U]| < |[G,G]|$ implies [11] $t_U \in T(\Lambda_\wedge U)$, by our hypothesis on G, permitting us to define

$$\xi_U = \mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi - t_U \in T(\Lambda_\wedge U)$$

and to define the *support* of ξ by

$$\mathrm{supp}(\xi) = \{U \geq A : C \cap [U,U] = 1 \text{ and } \xi_U \neq 0\}\,.$$

To investigate $U \in \mathrm{supp}(\xi)$, we state

Claim 1 :

a) *If* $A \leq V \leq U$ *and* $C \cap [U,U] = 1$*, then* $\mathrm{Res}_U^V\xi_U = \xi_V$ *and* $\xi_V^g = \xi_{V^g}$ *for* $g \in G$*.*

b) G *acts on* $\mathrm{supp}(\xi)$ *by conjugation.*

c) $A \notin \mathrm{supp}(\xi)$.

Proof. Recall that $t_U = \mathrm{Res}_G^U t_G$. Now, a) results from

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Res}_U^V\xi_U = \mathrm{Res}_U^V(\mathrm{Res}_G^U\xi - \mathrm{Res}_G^U t_G) = \mathrm{Res}_G^V\xi - \mathrm{Res}_G^V t_G = \xi_V \quad \text{and}\\ &\xi_V^g = \mathrm{Res}_G^V(\xi - t_G)^g = \mathrm{Res}_{G^g}^{V^g}(\xi^g - t_G^g) = \mathrm{Res}_G^{V^g}(\xi - t_G) = \xi_{V^g}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

---

[11] recall that $t_U = t_{K/K^U}$ by the Galois correspondence

by 3. of Lemma D, which at the same time implies b); c) follows from (5.1) and the definition of ‘supp’. $\square$

Moreover, we let, as in Lemma G, $N = N_G(U)$ be the normalizer of U in G. Define $\mathfrak{c}_U$ and $\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ by the exact sequences

$$\mathfrak{c}_U \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge(N/[U,U]) \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge(U/C[U,U]) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}} \rightarrowtail \Lambda_\wedge(U^{\mathrm{ab}}) \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge(U/C[U,U])\,.$$

Claim 2 : *If* $U \in \operatorname{supp}(\xi)$, *then* $\operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\xi_U \in \operatorname{tr}_{N/U}(\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}})$.

Proof. We first note that $t_{N/[U,U]}$ is in $T(\Lambda_\wedge(N/[U,U]))$: for the commutator subgroup $[N,N]/[U,U]$ of $N/[U,U]$ has smaller order than $[G,G]$ unless $[U,U]=1$ and $[N,N]=[G,G]$, in which case $A \notin \operatorname{supp}(\xi)$ implies $N < G$, because A is *maximal* abelian normal in G; but then $Z(G) \leq N$ implies $[N:Z(N)] \leq [N:Z(G)] < [G:Z(G)]$, contrary to the minimality hypothesis on G.

Writing $\operatorname{defl}_N^{N/[U,U]}\operatorname{Res}_G^N\xi = t_{N/[U,U]} + z_U$, with $z_U \in T(\Lambda_\wedge(N/[U,U]))$, and $\tau = \tau_{N/[U,U]}$, we consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & T(\Lambda_\wedge N) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, two heads] & T(\Lambda_\wedge\overline{N}) \arrow[d, two heads] \\
\tau(\mathfrak{c}_U) \arrow[r, tail] & T(\Lambda_\wedge(N/[U,U])) \arrow[r, two heads] & T(\Lambda_\wedge(N/C[U,U]))
\end{tikzcd} \quad ,$$

with all surjective maps deflations and exact bottom row by ii. of Lemma E applied to $N/[U,U] \geq U/[U,U] \geq C[U,U]/[U,U]$ in place of $G \geq A \geq C$; moreover, we also obtain $\operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\tau(\mathfrak{c}_U) = \operatorname{tr}_{N/U}(\mathfrak{c}_U^{\mathrm{ab}})$.

Since $\operatorname{Res}_G^N\xi \in T(\Lambda_\wedge N)$ has $\operatorname{defl}_N^{\overline{N}}\operatorname{Res}_G^N\xi = \operatorname{Res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{N}}\operatorname{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}\xi = \operatorname{Res}_{\overline{G}}^{\overline{N}}t_{\overline{G}} = t_{\overline{N}}$, the diagram implies $z_U \in \tau(\mathfrak{c}_U)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\xi_U + t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} = \operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}(\operatorname{Res}_G^U\xi - t_U) + t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} = \operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\operatorname{Res}_N^U(\operatorname{Res}_G^N\xi) = \\
&\operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\operatorname{defl}_N^{N/[U,U]}(\operatorname{Res}_G^N\xi) = \operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}(z_U + t_{N/[U,U]}) = \operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}z_U + t_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}
\end{aligned}$$

implies $\operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\xi_U = \operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}z_U \in \operatorname{Res}_{N/[U,U]}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\tau(\mathfrak{c}_U)$. Combining with the previous paragraph yields the claim. $\square$

Now continuing with the proof, it follows that the Theorem holds if we can modify ξ, subject to (5.1) holding, so that $\operatorname{supp}(\xi)$ is empty. Since this is not possible for our G, by hypothesis, there must exist an ξ for which $\operatorname{supp}(\xi)$ has *minimal cardinality* $\neq 0$.

Since $\operatorname{supp}(\xi)$ is non-empty it contains a U with *minimal* $[U:A]$. By Lemma G we may write

$$\operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\xi_U = \textstyle\sum_{y\in Y_1,\,1\neq c\in C}\alpha(y,c)\operatorname{tr}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}(\tilde{c}-1)) \tag{5.2}$$

with unique $\alpha(y,c)$ in $\Lambda_\wedge\Gamma$. As $A \notin \operatorname{supp}(\xi)$ every V with $A \leq V < U$ has $C \cap [V,V] = 1$ and $\xi_V = 0$; equivalently, we may restrict attention to maximal such V, hence may assume that V has index l in U (so, in particular, $[U,U] \lhd V$). Now

$$\operatorname{Res}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{V/[U,U]}(\operatorname{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}\xi_U) = \operatorname{defl}_V^{V/[U,U]}\operatorname{Res}_U^V\xi_U = \operatorname{defl}_V^{V/[U,U]}\xi_V = 0\,,$$

by a) of CLAIM 1. We apply $\mathrm{Res}^{V/[U,U]}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}$ to (5.2), observing (by 2. of Lemma D) that, for $u \in U^{\mathrm{ab}}$, $\mathrm{Res}^{V/[U,U]}_{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}(u(\tilde{c}-1)) = lu(\tilde{c}-1)$ if $u \in V/[U,U]$, and $= 0$, if not, because U^{ab} is abelian. It follows that

$$0 = \sum_{y \in Y_1 \cap (V/\Gamma C[U,U]),\, c \neq 1} l\alpha(y,c)\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}(\tilde{c}-1))$$

whenever $A \leq V \leq U$, $[U:V] = l$, and, therefore, that $\alpha(y,c) = 0$ unless $y \in Y_1$ is not in $V/\Gamma C[U,U]$.

In particular, if U/A is non-cyclic, then every element of U/A is contained in a maximal V/A for some V, hence $\mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}\xi_U = 0$. But then the UNIQUENESS PRINCIPLE, applied to to $A \lhd U$ instead of $A \lhd G$, implies that $\xi_U = 0$. Thus $U \notin \mathrm{supp}(\xi)$, contrary to assumption.

It follows that our U with minimal $[U:A]$ in $\mathrm{supp}(\xi)$ has U/A cyclic. Then $[U,U] \leq A$, $U/A \simeq \frac{U/\Gamma C[U,U]}{A/\Gamma C[U,U]}$, and

$$\mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}\xi_U = \sum_{y \in Y_1,\, \langle yA\rangle = U/A,\, 1 \neq c \in C} \alpha(y,c)\mathrm{tr}_{N/U}(\tilde{y}(\tilde{c}-1)), \tag{5.3}$$

because U/A now has a unique maximal subgroup V/A and so $y \in Y_1$ is not in $V/\Gamma C[U,U]$ precisely when yA generates U/A.

Now our THEOREM essentially follows from the next result.

CLAIM 3 : *Assume that U/A is cyclic. Set, in the notation of (5.3),*

$$\xi'' = \sum_{y \in Y_1,\, \langle yA\rangle = U/A,\, 1 \neq c \in C} \alpha(y,c)\tau_G(y'(c-1)) \quad \textit{in} \quad T(\Lambda_\wedge G),$$

with preimages $y' \in U$ of $\tilde{y}$ under $\mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}$. Then

i. $\mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}\mathrm{Res}^{U}_{G}\xi'' = \mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}\xi_U$, and

ii. if $A \leq U_1 \leq G$ then $\mathrm{Res}^{U_1}_{G}\xi'' \neq 0$ implies $\exists\, g \in G : U^g \leq U_1$.

PROOF. Recall that the y in the ξ''-sum have $\langle yA\rangle = U/A$. Applying 2. of Lemma D gives

$$\mathrm{Res}^{U}_{G}\xi'' = \sum_{y \in Y_1,\, \langle yA\rangle = U/A,\, 1 \neq c} \alpha(y,c) \sum_{x \in G/U} \dot{\tau}_U((y')^x(c-1)).$$

Note that $(y')^x \in U$ implies $(yA)^x \in U/A$, hence $(U/A)^x = U/A$, i.e., $x \in N$. Now we have

$$\mathrm{Res}^{U}_{G}\xi'' = \sum_{y,c} \alpha(y,c) \sum_{x \in N/U} \tau_U((y')^x(c-1)),$$

hence applying $\mathrm{defl}^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}}_{U}$ gives i.

For ii. note that y still has $\langle yA\rangle = U/A$, but we now apply 2. of Lemma D with U replaced by U_1. Some term $\mathrm{Res}^{U_1}_{G}\tau_G(y'(c-1))$ in this sum must be $\neq 0$, by hypothesis; but this term is

$\sum_{x_1 \in G/U} \dot{\tau}_{U_1}((y')^{x_1}(c-1))$, so we must have a non-zero term here, i.e., $(y')^{x_1} \in U_1$ for some x_1. Now $(U/A)^{x_1} \subseteq U_1/A$ implies $U^{x_1} \subseteq U_1$. □

We apply CLAIM 3 and set $\xi' \overset{\text{def}}{=} \xi - \xi''$. Then $\mathrm{Res}_G^A \xi' = t_A$, by ii. with $U_1 = A$; moreover, due to the appearance of the elements $1 \neq c \in C$ in ξ'', $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G/C} \xi' = t_{G/C}$; thus ξ' satisfies (5.1). Further, $\mathrm{supp}(\xi') \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\xi)$: for if $U_1 \in \mathrm{supp}(\xi')$ then $C \cap [U_1, U_1] = 1$ and $\xi'_{U_1} \neq 0$, hence $\xi_{U_1} = \xi'_{U_1} + \mathrm{Res}_G^{U_1} \xi''$ is nonzero unless $\mathrm{Res}_G^{U_1} \xi'' \neq 0$; but in that case $U_1 \supseteq U^g$ for some $g \in G$ by ii., hence CLAIM 1 implies $\xi_{U_1} \neq 0$, as $\mathrm{Res}_{U_1}^{U^g} \xi_{U_1} = \xi_{U^g} \neq 0$ by $U \in \mathrm{supp}(\xi)$. But now i. and ii. of CLAIM 3 imply $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} \xi'_U = 0$ and $\xi'_{U_1} = 0$ for $A \leq U_1 < U$, hence $\xi'_U = 0$ by the UNIQUENESS PRINCIPLE. Thus $U \notin \mathrm{supp}(\xi')$, which contradicts the minimal cardinality of $\mathrm{supp}(\xi)$ and therefore finishes the proof of the THEOREM. □

6. l-ELEMENTARY GROUPS

Recall that $G = G(K/k) = \langle z \rangle \times G[l]$ is l-elementary.

LEMMA I. *i) The logarithm $\mathbb{L} : K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \to T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G)$ of diagram (D1) has image in $T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$.*

ii) Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the kernel of $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} : \Lambda_\wedge G \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_\wedge G^{\mathrm{ab}}$. Then the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
1+\mathfrak{a} \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d] & (\Lambda_\wedge G)^\times \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, "\mathbb{L}"'] & (\Lambda_\wedge G^{\mathrm{ab}})^\times \arrow[d, "\mathbb{L}^{\mathrm{ab}}"'] \\
\tau_G(\mathfrak{a}) \arrow[r, tail] & T(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r, two heads] & \Lambda_\wedge G^{\mathrm{ab}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

has exact rows and surjective left vertical map.

PROOF. For i), abbreviate $G[l]$ as U. Each $\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}$-irreducible character β of $\langle z \rangle$ induces a $\mathbb{Z}_l$-algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}_l[\langle z \rangle] \to \mathbb{Z}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}$ with image $\mathbb{Z}_l[\beta]$, hence surjective ring homomorphisms

$$\mathbb{Q}_l[\langle z \rangle] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_l(\beta)\,,\ \Lambda_\wedge G \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_l[\beta] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_l} \Lambda_\wedge U \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda_\wedge^\beta U\,,\ \mathcal{Q}_\wedge G \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^\beta U\,.$$

Applying the functors K_1 and T gives the southeast and southwest arrows of the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[rrr] \arrow[dr] \arrow[ddd] & & & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G) \arrow[dl] \arrow[ddd] \\
& K_1(\Lambda_\wedge^\beta U) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge^\beta U) \arrow[d] & \\
& \mathrm{HOM}^{(\beta)}(R_l U, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k)^\times) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Hom}^{(\beta)}(R_l U, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k) & \\
\mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k)^\times) \arrow[rrr] \arrow[ur] & & & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k) \arrow[ul]
\end{tikzcd}$$

with large square from diagram (D1) of §2, and small square [RW3, 2. of Proposition 11] with unramified coefficients $\mathbb{Z}_l[\beta]$, which are abbreviated by the superscript β. The northwest and northeast arrows $f \mapsto f^\beta$ are defined by $f^\beta(\varpi) = f(\beta \otimes \varpi)$.

To see that the left quadrangle commutes [12] let $H' = H \cap U$ (recalling that H is the kernel of $G \to \Gamma_k$), hence $H = \langle z \rangle \times H'$, and let $\beta(x)$ denote the image of $x \in \Lambda_\wedge G$ in $\Lambda_\wedge^\beta U$. We must

---

[12] this can also be obtained from [RW4, Theorem 1]

check that $(\mathrm{Det}x)^{\beta}(\varpi) = (\mathrm{Det}\beta(x))(\varpi)$, i.e. [13], $\det_{\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_k}(x \mid \mathfrak{V}_{\beta\otimes\varpi}) = \det(\beta(x) \mid \mathfrak{V}_{\varpi})$. Here, $\mathfrak{V}_{\varpi} = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[H']}(V_{\varpi}, \mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l(\beta)} \mathcal{Q}^{\beta}_{\wedge}U) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[H']}(V_{\varpi}, \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}U)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{V}_{\beta\otimes\varpi} &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[H]}(V_{\beta\otimes\varpi}, \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}G) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[\langle z\rangle]\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}}\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[H']}(V_{\beta} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}} V_{\varpi}, \mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[\langle z\rangle] \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}} \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}U)\\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}[H']}(V_{\beta} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}} V_{\varpi}, V_{\beta} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}} \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}U)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Then $h \mapsto 1 \otimes h$ is an isomorphism $\mathfrak{V}_{\varpi} \to \mathfrak{V}_{\beta\otimes\varpi}$ of vector spaces over $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_k$ and one checks that $(1 \otimes h)x = 1 \otimes h \cdot \beta(x)$.

The same argument, with T, Tr rather than K_1, Det, yields the commutativity of the right quadrangle, and the commutativity of the bottom quadrangle follows from the formula for $\mathbf{L}$ by $\psi_l(\beta) = \beta^{\mathrm{Fr}}$. The diagram now implies that the top quadrangle commutes.

Recall that, [RW3, Proposition 11], the logarithm $\mathbb{L}_{\beta} : K_1(\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U) \to T(\mathcal{Q}^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)$ is integral for all β. It thus suffices to show that if $x \in T(\mathcal{Q}_{\wedge}G)$ has image in $T\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)$ under the southwest arrow for every β, then $x \in T(\Lambda_{\wedge}U)$.

Letting β run through a set of representatives of the $G(\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}/\mathbb{Q}_l)$-action on the $\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}$-irreducible characters of $\langle z\rangle$ we get an isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}_l[\langle z\rangle] \to \prod_{\beta}\mathbb{Z}_l[\beta]$. This induces isomorphisms $T(\Lambda_{\wedge}G) \to \bigoplus_{\beta} T(\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)$ and $T(\mathcal{Q}_{\wedge}G) \to \bigoplus_{\beta} T(\mathcal{Q}^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)$. The first of these provides an $x' \in T(\Lambda_{\wedge}G)$ with the same images as x for all β, and the second gives $x = x' \in T(\Lambda_{\wedge}G)$.

We now prove ii). The exact sequence defining $\mathfrak{a}$ gives the top row since $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{rad}(\Lambda_{\wedge}G)$, as $[G,G]$ is an l-group. The bottom row is exact by ii) of Lemma E. To see the vertical surjectivity, write $\mathfrak{u}$ for the kernel of $\mathrm{defl}_U^{U^{\mathrm{ab}}} : \Lambda_{\wedge}U \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_{\wedge}U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ (with $U = G[l]$); also write $\mathfrak{u}^{\beta}$ for the kernel of $\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U^{\mathrm{ab}}$ (with β as before). Then the map $1 + \mathfrak{u}^{\beta} \to \tau_U(\mathfrak{u}^{\beta})$ induced by $\mathbb{L}_{\beta} : (\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)^{\times} \to T(\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)$ is surjective [RW3, 2b. of Proposition 11]. Identifying $\Lambda_{\wedge}G$ and $\prod_{\beta}\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U$ as in the last paragraph of the proof of i) (also for the abelianizations), and assembling our asserted diagram in terms of the β-decomposition, noting that the commutativity of the square at right follows from that of the top quadrangle in i), we deduce that $1 + \mathfrak{a} \to \tau_G(\mathfrak{a})$ is also surjective.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\Lambda_{\wedge}G)^{\times} \arrow[r, "\beta"] \arrow[d, "\mathbb{L}"'] & (\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)^{\times} \arrow[d, "\mathbb{L}_{\beta}"'] \\
T(\Lambda_{\wedge}G) \arrow[r, "\beta"] & T(\Lambda^{\beta}_{\wedge}U)
\end{tikzcd}$$

□

Recall that, for a pro-l group $G = G(K/k)$ and an open subgroup $G' \leq G$,

$$\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'} : \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_lG, \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_k) \to \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_lG', \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_{k'})$$

is defined in [RW8,§1]. We partially extend this definition to l-elementary G.

Lemma J. *Let $G = \langle z\rangle \times G[l]$ be l-elementary. If G' is an open subgroup of G containing $\langle z\rangle$, define for $f \in \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_lG, \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_k)$*

$$\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'} f = [\,\chi' \mapsto f(\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\chi') + \sum_{r\geq 1}\frac{\Psi^r}{l^r}\,(f(\psi_l^{r-1}\chi))\,] \in \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_lG', \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\wedge}\Gamma_{k'})\,,$$

---

[13] compare also [RW2, Proposition 6; RW3, Lemma 2]

where $\chi' \in R_l G'$ *,* ψ_l *denotes the* l^{th} *Adams operation,* $\chi \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \psi_l(\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\chi') - \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}(\psi_l\chi')$ *and* $k' = K^{G'}$*. Then* Res *is additive, integral and transitive. Moreover, the diagram below, and so diagram (D2), commutes.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Det}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{res}_G^{G'}"'] & \mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k)^\times) \arrow[r, "\mathbf{L}"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{res}_G^{G'}"'] & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'}"'] & T(\Lambda_\wedge G) \arrow[l, "\mathrm{Tr}"'] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'}"'] \\
K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G') \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Det}"] & \mathrm{HOM}(R_l G', (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_{k'})^\times) \arrow[r, "\mathbf{L}"] & \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G', \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_{k'}) & T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G') \arrow[l, "\mathrm{Tr}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. We first observe that for a suitable power l^{r_0} of l, $G^{l^{r_0}} \subset G'$, thus

$$\psi_l^{r_0-1}\chi = \psi_l^{r_0-1}(\psi_l(\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\chi') - \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}(\psi_l\chi')) = 0 \ :$$

compare [loc.cit.] and note, restricting attention to irreducible χ', that $\chi' = \beta' \otimes \varpi'$ for some irreducible $\mathbb{Q}_l{}^{\mathrm{c}}$-characters β' and ϖ' whose kernels contain $G'[l]$, $\langle z \rangle$, respectively. Then $\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\chi' = \beta \otimes \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\varpi'$ with $\mathrm{res}_{G}^{G'}\beta = \beta'$, whence

$$\psi_l(\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\chi') - \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}(\psi_l\chi') = \psi_l(\beta) \otimes (\psi_l(\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}\varpi') - \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^{G}(\psi_l\varpi'))\,.$$

For the first assertion, we just proceed as in [loc.cit., top of p.120 and Proof of Proposition A].

Finally, the map $\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'}$ on the very right is defined by transporting $\mathrm{Res}_G^{G'} : \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G, \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k) \to \mathrm{Hom}^*(R_l G', \mathcal{Q}_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_{k'})$ to $T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G) \to T(\mathcal{Q}_\wedge G')$ by means of the isomorphism 'Tr'; in particular, the right square commutes. The middle square commutes because of the computations shown in [loc.cit., Proof of Lemma 1]. And commutativity of the left square is [RW2, Lemma 9]. Observing that $\mathbb{L} = \mathrm{Tr}^{-1}\mathbf{L}\mathrm{Det}$, diagram (D2) is obtained from arranging columns 1, 4 and 3 with $\mathbb{L}$ and Tr as horizontal maps. □

We close this section with adjusting the arguments in §1 for the proof of Proposition 3 for pro-l groups to l-elementary groups G.

Lemma k. *i) If* $t_{K/k} \in T(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ *then there is a unique torsion* $w \in \mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}}\Gamma_k)^\times)$ *with* $wL_{K/k} \in \mathrm{Det}K_1(\Lambda_\wedge G)$ *and* $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} w = 1$ *.*

ii) Moreover, if G *has an abelian subgroup* G' *of index* l*, then*

$$w = 1 \iff \mathrm{ver}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{G'}\lambda_{K^{[G,G]}/k} \equiv \lambda_{K/k'} \mod \mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge G')$$

where $k' = K^{G'}$ *and* $Q = G/G'$*.*

Proof. For i), using the diagram in ii) of Lemma i to replace the one in the proof of [RW5, Proposition 2.2] there exists a $y \in (\Lambda_\wedge G)^\times$ so $\mathbb{L}(y) = t_{K/k}$ and $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} w = 1$. Following the proof of [loc.cit., Proposition 2.4] one defines w by $wL_{K/k} = \mathrm{Det}y$ and checks that $\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} w = 1$ and $\mathbf{L}(w) = 0$. This implies w is torsion by the indicated argument from [RW3, p.46] by observing that, while $\psi_l^n\chi$ is only a character β of $G/G[l]$ for large n, $\beta = \mathrm{infl}_{G^{\mathrm{ab}}}^{G}\beta'$

still implies that $w(\beta) = (\mathrm{defl}_G^{G^{\mathrm{ab}}} w)(\beta') = \chi(1)1$. The argument for the uniqueness of w still works because [RW3, Lemma 12] is already proved for $\Lambda_\wedge^\beta(G[l])$ in the notation of Lemma I.

More precisely, in the notation of the proof of ii) of Lemma I, let $x \in 1 + \mathfrak{a}$ have $\mathrm{Det}x$ torsion. By the commutativity of the left quadrangle in the proof of i) of Lemma I, $\beta(x) \in 1 + \mathfrak{u}^\beta$ has $\mathrm{Det}\beta(x)$ torsion, hence we have $\mathrm{Det}\beta(x) = 1$, and so it suffices to observe that $\mathrm{HOM}(R_l G, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k)^\times) \to \prod_\beta \mathrm{HOM}^\beta(R_l U, (\Lambda_\wedge^{\mathrm{c}} \Gamma_k)^\times)$ is injective.

To verify ii), we follow the proof [RW5, equivalence of (1) and (2) in Proposition 3.2], except that we still need to show that the only torsion unit $e \in \Lambda_\wedge G'$ congruent to 1 mod $\mathrm{tr}_Q(\Lambda_\wedge G')$ is 1, even when G is l-elementary. Decomposing the torsion subgroup H of G as $H = \langle z \rangle \times H'$ we have $G' = \Gamma \times H'$ with $\Gamma \simeq \Gamma_{k'}$ and $\Lambda_\wedge G' = \prod_\beta (\Lambda_\wedge^\beta \Gamma)[H']$. Now $\beta(e) \equiv 1$ mod $\mathrm{tr}_Q((\Lambda_\wedge^\beta \Gamma)[H'])$, hence $\beta(e) = 1$ by Higman's theorem for $(\Lambda_\wedge^\beta \Gamma)[H']$, see [RW3, p.47]. This holds for all β, hence $e = 1$. $\square$

APPENDIX

The proof of [RW2, Proposition 12 (a)] refers to [RWt, Proposition 4.8] which, however, requires Leopoldt's conjecture (see [RWt, Lemma 3.4]). We recall the statement made in [RW2] (suppressing the index ∞ on K and G as well as the $\tilde{}$ on $\mho_S$):

> *If N is a finite normal subgroup of G with factor group $\overline{G}$ and fixed field $\overline{K} = K^N$, then* $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}} : K_0T(\Lambda G) \to K_0T(\Lambda \overline{G})$ *takes $\mho_S = \mho_{K/k,S}$ to $\overline{\mho}_S = \mho_{\overline{K}/k,S}$.*

The refinement $\mho_{K/k,S}$ of the Iwasawa module $X = X_{K/k,S} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} G(M/K)$, with M the maximal abelian S-ramified l-extension of K, is described in [RW1,§1].

Here is a direct argument for the above claim.

Let $\overline{M}$ be the maximal abelian S-ramified l-extension of $\overline{K}$, hence $G(\overline{M}/\overline{K})$ is the biggest abelian pro-l quotient of $G(M/\overline{K})$. Consider the diagram below, where $\tilde{X}$ is the pushout of i and ver, and the transfer $G(M/\overline{K}) \to X^N$ factors through $G(\overline{M}/\overline{K})$ since X^N is abelian pro-l. The bottom row is called the deflation of the top one in [RWt,§3.2].

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X = G(M/K) \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d, phantom, "\cap"] & G(M/k) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, equal] & G(K/k) = G \arrow[d, two heads] \\
G(M/\overline{K}) \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d, two heads] & G(M/k) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, two heads] & G(\overline{K}/k) = \overline{G} \arrow[d, equal] \\
\overline{X} = G(\overline{M}/\overline{K}) \arrow[r, tail, "i"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{ver}"'] & G(\overline{M}/\overline{K}) \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d] & \overline{G} \arrow[d, equal] \\
X^N \arrow[r, tail] & \tilde{X} \arrow[r, two heads] & \overline{G}\,,
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the Appendix 4.A analogue of Lemma 3.2 [loc.cit.] the translation functor turns the bottom two rows into [14]

---

[14] here ΔG denotes the augmentation ideal of ΛG

$$\text{(A1)}\qquad \begin{tikzcd}\overline{X} \arrow[r, tail] \arrow[d] & \overline{Y} \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d] & \Delta\overline{G} \arrow[d, equal] \\ X^N \arrow[r, tail] & Y_N \arrow[r, two heads] & (\Delta G)_N\,,\end{tikzcd}$$

by replacing the bottom one by the equivalent extension given by the ΛG-analogue of Lemma 3.3. Here we should note that Y has projective dimension ≤ 1 over ΛG [RW1, Theorem 1], hence Y has projective dimension ≤ 1 over $\mathbb{Z}_l[N]$ [loc.cit., proof of 2. of Proposition 4, which does not need M to be finite].

Suppose that we know that ver : $G(\overline{M}/\overline{K}) \to X^N$ is an isomorphism, hence that the extensions in (A1) are equivalent. If we use, [loc.cit.,§1], $X \rightarrowtail Y \to \Lambda G \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_l$ to compute $\mho$ then taking N-coinvariants computes the analogous $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}(\mho)$ for the bottom row of (A1) (cf. the analogy with [RWt, Lemma 4B.1, p.41]). By (A1), the same procedure for the top row computes $\overline{\mho}$. Thus $\mathrm{defl}_G^{\overline{G}}(\mho) = \overline{\mho}$.

Concerning $G(\overline{M}/\overline{K}) \xrightarrow{\text{ver}} X^N$, let L be the maximal S-ramified Galois extension of k or, equivalently, of k_∞. Denote the corresponding Galois groups by $\mathfrak{G}$ and $\mathfrak{H}$, respectively; so $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrowtail \mathfrak{G} \twoheadrightarrow \Gamma_k$ is exact. Moreover, set $V = G(L/K)$ and $U = G(L/\overline{K})$, whence $V \rightarrowtail U \twoheadrightarrow N$.

Assume that we already know $\mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) = 2$. Then we proceed as follows. As U is open in $\mathfrak{H}$, it follows that also $\mathrm{scd}_l(U) = 2$ by [NSW, p.139/140]. The proof of [(i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii)] of [loc.cit., Theorem 3.6.4, p.160] gives the isomorphism $H^2(V,\mathbb{Z})(l)_N \xrightarrow{\text{cor}} H^2(U,\mathbb{Z})(l)$ (see [loc.cit., 3.3.8, p.142]) and so $(U^{\mathrm{ab}})_l \xrightarrow{\text{ver}} (V^{\mathrm{ab}})_l^N$. Since $(U^{\mathrm{ab}})_l = G(\overline{M}/\overline{K}) = \overline{X}$, $(V^{\mathrm{ab}})_l = G(M/K) = X$ finishes the proof.

Hence it remains to show $\mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) = 2$. Now, $\mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) \leq 2$ is a consequence of the weak Leopoldt conjecture (see [loc.cit., 10.3.26, p.549]) and then $\mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) = 2$ results from the remark following it, of which we add a proof: Assume $\mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) \leq 1$. Then $\mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) \leq 1$ and $\mathrm{cd}_l(\Gamma_k) = 1$, hence $2 = \mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{G}) \leq \mathrm{cd}_l(\Gamma_k) + \mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{H})$ implies $\mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{H}) = 1$. Note that $\mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{G}) = 2$ by [loc.cit., 10.9.3, p.587]. Denoting a Sylow-l subgroup of $\mathfrak{H}$ by $\mathfrak{H}_l$, we have $\mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{H}_l) = 1 = \mathrm{scd}_l(\mathfrak{H}_l)$ [loc.cit.,3.3.6, p.141] and thus $H^2(\mathfrak{H}_l,\mathbb{Z})(l) = 0$ [loc.cit.,3.3.4, p.139]. Hence $H^1(\mathfrak{H}_l,\mathbb{Q}_l/\mathbb{Z}_l) = 0$ and so $\mathfrak{H}_l = 1$, contradicting $\mathrm{cd}_l(\mathfrak{H}_l) = 1$.

REFERENCES

[CR] Curtis, C.W. and Reiner, I., *Methods of Representation Theory, vol. 2.* John Wiley & Sons (1987)

[DR] Deligne, P. and Ribet, K., *Values of abelian L-functions at negative integers over totally real fields.* Invent. Math. **59** (1980), 227-286

[FK] Fukaya, T., Kato, K., *A formulation of conjectures on p-adic zeta functions in noncommutative Iwasawa theory.* Proceedings of the St. Petersburg Mathematical Society, vol. XII (ed. N.N. Uraltseva), AMS Translations – Series 2, **219** (2006), 1-86

[HIÖ] Hawkes, T., Isaacs, I.M. and Özaydin, M., *On the Möbius function of a finite group.* Rocky Mountain J. of Mathematics **19** (1989), 1003-1033

[Ka] Kato, K. , *Iwasawa theory and generalizations.* Proc. ICM, Madrid, Spain, 2006; European Math. Soc. (2007), 335-357

[La] Lau, I., *Algebraic contributions to equivariant Iwasawa theory.* Ph.D. thesis, Universität Augsburg (2010)

[NSW] Neukirch, J., Schmidt, A. and Wingberg, K., *Cohomology of Number Fields.* Springer Grundlehren der math. Wiss. **323** (2000)

[RW] Ritter, J. and Weiss, A. ,

t. *The Lifted Root Number Conjecture and Iwasawa theory.* Memoirs of the AMS **157/748** (2002)

1. *Towards equivariant Iwasawa theory.* manuscripta math. **109** (2002), 131-146
2. ⋯ *, II.* Indag. Mathemat. **15** (2004), 549-572
3. ⋯ *, III.* Math. Ann. **336** (2006), 27-49
4. ⋯ *, IV.* Homology, Homotopy and Applications **7** (2005), 155-171
5. *Non-abelian pseudomeasures and congruences between abelian Iwasawa L-functions.* Pure and Applied Math. Quarterly **4** (2008), 1085-1106
6. *The integral logarithm in Iwasawa theory: an exercise.* To appear in Journal de Théorie des Nombres Bordeaux **22** (2010)
7. *Congruences between abelian pseudomeasures.* Math.Res. Lett. **15** (2008), 715-725
8. *Equivariant Iwasawa Theory: An Example.* Documenta Math. **13** (2008), 117-129
9. *Congruences between abelian pseudomeasures, II.* arXiv:1001.2091 [math.NT]

[Se] Serre, J.-P. , *Sur le résidu de la fonction zêta p-adique d'un corps de nombres.* C.R.Acad.Sci. Paris **287** (1978), série A, 183-188

[Wi] Wiles, A., *The Iwasawa conjecture for totally real fields.* Annals of Math. **131** (1990), 493-540

Jürgen Ritter, Schnurbeinstraße 14, 86391 Deuringen, Germany; `jr@ritter-maths.de`
Alfred Weiss, Department of Mathematics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2G1; `weissa@ualberta.ca`